XAVIER
UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

GEO A. FLOHR CO.
LIBRARY
JUL 29 1965

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

VOL. XCIII, No. 3 JULY, 1964

CONTENTS FOR JULY, 1964

ON THE VIRTUES OF HUMILITY AND OBEDIENCE: 231
Two recent letters of Very Reverend Father General

THE JESUIT SCHOLAR AND THE SECULAR CAMPUS: 253
A symposium edited by Robert S. Fitzgerald, S.J.

RESEARCH AS A PRELUDE TO AGGIORNAMENTO: 287
Richard J. Pendergast, S.J.

THE MODERN WORLD AND JESUIT RELEVANCE: 297
Louis J. Twomey, S.J.

A REPORT: The El Paso Project: 313
E. Tafoya, S.J.

OBITUARY: FATHER JOSEPH T. O'CALLAHAN, S.J. 317
Richard J. Dowling, S.J.

CONTRIBUTORS

Fr. Paul C. Reinert (Missouri Province) is President of St. Louis University.

Fr. Theodore V. Purcell (Chicago Province) was Tucker Visiting Lecturer at Dartmouth College in 1961-62, and is now Acting Director of the Institute of Social Order.

Fr. Vincent T. O'Keefe (New York Province) is President of Fordham College.

Fr. Charles A. Frankenhoff (New York Province) is Professor of Economics at the University of Puerto Rico.

Fr. Patrick A. Donohoe (California Province) is President of the University of Santa Clara.

Fr. John A. Hardon (Detroit Province) is Associate Professor of Religion at Western Michigan University.

Fr. David J. Bowman (Chicago Province) was Visiting Lecturer in the School of Religion at the State University of Iowa, and is now Assistant Professor of Religious Education at The Catholic University of America.

Mr. Robert S. Fitzgerald (Detroit Province) is a theologian at Woodstock College, and a Research Fellow at Johns Hopkins University.

Fr. Richard Pendergast (New York Province) is a tertian at Auriesville.

Fr. L. J. Twomey (New Orleans Province) is Director of the Institute of Social Order, Loyola University, New Orleans.

Fr. Edward Tafoya (New Orleans Province) recently completed studies at St. Mary's College, Kansas.

Fr. Richard Dowling (New England Province) is Professor of Psychology at Holy Cross College.

For Jesuit Use Only

Published four times a year, in February, April, July and November.

Entered as second-class matter December 1, 1942, at the post office at Woodstock Maryland, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Subscription: Five Dollars Yearly

WOODSTOCK COLLEGE PRESS
WOODSTOCK, MARYLAND
21163

A Letter of Very Reverend Father General To the Whole Society

On the Virtues of Humility and Obedience

Reverend Fathers and dear Brothers in Christ:
Pax Christi!

1. We are all well aware how very greatly St. Ignatius esteemed the humility of Christ in all its forms, together with the poverty of Christ. Do we not rightly consider the third degree of humility as a climax of the Spiritual Exercises? The "garments and livery of Christ," which candidates to the Society are invited to love, (and all the more, those who have entered the Society and are persevering in it) are nothing else than our religious life itself; for in this he who is admitted "desires earnestly to obey and to be humbled," and so "to attain eternal happiness." (Exam. c. 4 n. 45 [102]) The third degree of humility is found substantially in our life itself, if one leads it in the manner desired by our Constitutions.

2. As is evident from very many places in the writings of our Founder, that obedience was particularly dear to him which we call the obedience of the will and judgment. He often speaks severely of those who cling too tenaciously to their own opinion and considers them to be little suited to the Society. He had very little love for those whom he called "the critics," who are convinced that they have a superior knowledge of everything and are accustomed to sit in judgment on whatever is being done or has been done.

3. I am somewhat afraid, however, that at times the true concept of that famed "obedience of the judgment," in which our holy Father says the perfection of obedience consists, may be rather wrongly understood or explained. In this somewhat

complex matter I humbly offer the following thoughts for your consideration. Does not that virtue which is called the obedience "of the judgment" really consist in a true internal humility, which therefore is called "obedience" because it prepares and disposes the soul for exercising that other virtue perfectly? One who is sincerely humble does not over-estimate the worth of his own judgment. He knows indeed that he has received from his Creator the power of thinking and judging for himself; that he can never, against the dictate of his own conscience, state that he sees black where he really sees white*; that it is never allowed to neglect the duty of internal sincerity, nor can anyone desire this of us. At the same time, unless we are blinded by pride, we all know that we are not infallible; that others also are endowed with intellect and good judgment; that between opposing or differing opinions, it is possible that I may judge correctly, but it is also possible that anothers judgment may be more accurate, and this all the more truly

* What St. Ignatius has written in the 13th of the "Rules for Thinking with the Church" is something completely different. There the question is of submitting even the intellect to the pronouncements of the teaching power of the Church and its supreme head. When the Church speaks solemnly by virtue of its teaching power, "if it defines that what seems to our eyes white, is black, we also should affirm that it is black." In other words, when God speaks as the Giver of Revelation, or His authentic interpreter, the Church, we should agree with the authority of God even against the evidence of our own senses. As is evident, this is not the place to develop this doctrine more fully or exactly.—However, in this letter there is not question of the teaching power of the Church, but of the authority of a religious Superior; and it merely asserts that we should not affirm against our own conscience that what we behold is black when we see it is white.—Some find difficulty in the passage in the Letter on Obedience, (n. 18): "as to believe what the Catholic Faith proposes, you at once bend all the forces of your mind to assent thereunto; so to do whatever your Superior commands you must be borne by a blind impulse of your will, eager to obey, without stopping to argue at all." Let us note that in this passage an analogy is drawn without asserting any identity of the cases. When in the Church there is question of "belief," there should be no mention of one's own opinion; when in Religion there is question of "action," often, and indeed most of the time, it will be more perfect humbly to keep silent about one's own feeling and to obey simply, in the manner of children. Nevertheless, St. Ignatius immediately adds (l.c., n. 19) in the manner of correcting a doctrine that in itself might be more severe than just, that one may set before the Superior any considerations that may be opposed.

if he is a man of longer experience, more fully informed, and perhaps also more abundantly illumined by the Holy Spirit. And so the man who is sincerely humble will be inclined to feel that he can be wrong more easily than another. He will also consider that if this other be a Superior, he may know many more details about the matter, including some which he cannot reveal by reason of the secrecy enjoined upon him by his office; that even if he is a Superior, he is not completely lacking in all common sense; but rather, though he may not be endowed with even the lowest degree of infallibility, yet he may be said to enjoy what is called "the grace of state;" for God will not deny entirely the gift of prudence to a man whom, for the most part unwilling and certainly not seeking the post of his own will, His Providence has placed over a community of Religious in His Church.

4. One who considers all these things, and conducts himself according to this humble understanding, will for the most part easily fulfill what St. Ignatius included under the "obedience of the intellect." If one should ask in what way we can come to the perfection of obedience, our Founder responds in the words of St. Leo: "Nothing is difficult to the humble, and nothing hard to the meek; so that if you are not wanting in humility or meekness, assuredly God will not be wanting in goodness, to help you to perform what you have promised Him, not patiently only but willingly." (Letter on the Virtue of Obedience, n. 15) St. Ignatius in no way intends that we should ever act against that interior sincerity I have mentioned or our own conscience. He exempts from the abnegation of our own judgment those cases in which "the evidence of the known truth forces the will;" (Letter on the Virtue of Obedience, n. 9) and he wishes only that the assent of the understanding "may by the strength of the will be inclined more one way than another." And he explicitly warns us that "if anything occurs to you different from the Superior's opinion," it is not forbidden to lay the matter before him, after consulting God in prayer and asking for the light of the Holy Spirit.

5. If anyone considers this Letter on the Virtue of Obedience with a calm mind and without any preconceived opinions, he will marvel at the moderation, the prudence, and the practical

psychological knowledge of its author. And indeed, if we wish to understand it aright, it is necessary that we read it also with a certain sense of the historical approach, keeping in mind the manner of speaking of the 16th Century, and the literary genre to which it belongs, that is, a spiritual exhortation. Anyone who would read the Letter on the Virtue of Obedience as a juridical or dogmatic treatise of our own day, would understand and interpret it wrongly, just as one who would wish to interpret the Parables of Our Lord in the Gospel without any regard for the nature of parables or the manner of speech common in Palestine in those far-off times.

6. Finally, it may be allowed to add that when a course of action is being considered, we ought to remain mindful of that well-worn truth: "There are more ways than one of doing anything well." In other words, when the Superior thinks that one way of doing a thing is better, the subject another, it can happen that both are right, if indeed the matter may be well done in two or more ways. Unless we are really lacking in humility and right judgment, we shall with a good spirit accept and approve what the Superior has decided. This is a matter not so much of humility as of common sense.

7. We willingly accept obedience, since it is necessary for the apostolate. We all understand that the labor of many workers, such as is the work of the Society and the Church, cannot go forward successfully unless there is someone who will direct the efforts of all and make them tend together to the same end. As in any private or public organization there should be some one who will provide that matters will proceed, not without leadership but by ordered plan, so in the apostolic order. In any university or college, in a foreign mission, in a retreat house, in any house of studies, or center of social action, or parish, if each and every one can act according to his own ideas, without any norm or rule or guidance from a Superior, where shall we end? One will tear down what another is trying to build. Indeed, reason itself and experience teach us that more is achieved when all with one mind follow out the same prescribed course of action, even if it be not the most perfect one, than when the individual members go in different directions and scatter their efforts, on the pretext of a more perfect plan.

8. What is true of our works, is true also of the life of each of our communities. Unless a determined order of time is sufficiently well kept by all, what time will be found that is suitable for the recollection, the prayer and the study that is appointed?

9. But this obedience, which is required for the external and social order, for cooperation and unity in work, is a common need of State and Church, of private associations in the world and of ecclesiastical communities.

10. Our obedience embraces another element which is peculiarly characteristic of the religious life as such. For we are not an assemblage of good priests who have gathered together into one group to be more effectively free for the apostolate. By the will of our holy Founder, and of the Church which has approved and still approves us as such and as such only, we are Religious in fact, and not merely in name. They make a very great mistake who would wish us to become as much as possible like zealous secular priests living in common. Our religious life indeed has certain characteristics of its own, in which our Founder has departed from the usages of older Orders. In place of the government by chapters which they have, St. Ignatius has preferred the form of monarchical government, and indeed that kind of monarchy which today we call "constitutional," and to some extent "parliamentary" (with an aristocratic, not a democratic senate set over the General). In the practice of our religious life, he wished us to be perfectly free to move, so that the Superior could send us to any part of the world; (Const. P. IX, c. 2, G [304]; P. V c. 3 n. 5 [588]) and so he wished us not to be hampered by the obligation of choir. In brief, he kept only those observances which would sanctify us and at the same time leave us more fit and efficient for the apostolate.

11. Among these observances, the usual vows of Religious occupy the first place; that is, poverty, chastity and obedience, so that we might lead both faithful and unbelievers to Christ by the example of a life which in those times was called "reformed," which we would designate as a fervent life and dedicated to giving an example by the evangelical virtues. Indeed, the obedience of Religious in the whole tradition of Christianity is nothing else than the imitation, so far as we can achieve it,

of that obedience of which the Word made Flesh has left us the example. As the Son of God "emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant, and in habit found as a man;" as "He humbled Himself, becoming obedient unto death, even to the death of the Cross;" (Phil. 2, 7-8) so the Religious has "emptied himself" by surrendering his own independence and yielding his own will into the hands of the Superior delegated by the Church for this purpose, not only for the sake of working together with others for the accomplishment of apostolic labor, but for the sake also of ordering his whole private life, not by his own will but by the will of another. If anyone should wish to understand and explain the obedience of Religious by philosophy or human reason alone, his attempt will be in vain and will lie outside the path of truth. Obedience in the religious life is a theological problem, which cannot be completely explained except by the economy of Revelation. As only the Church, the Spouse of Christ, can with full security point out the road to salvation, so she alone can point out the road to Christian perfection. Even in this age so dedicated to progress, if we wish to make a judgment on our own life, we must go not to reason alone, but before all else to the teaching of the Gospel authentically set forth by the Church. Religious obedience moreover, which St. Benedict called "a degree of humility," (Rules of the Monks, Chap. VII) is commended down to our own day as something essential in the life of perfection, in the letters, the exhortations, the utterances of the Holy See, and especially in the words of the Popes.

12. At the end of the two years of probation, the Jesuit novice vows obedience, that is, the abnegation of his own will and liberty, in order that he may make progress in humility and charity. The professed and the spiritual and temporal coadjutor vows the same complete renunciation of his own liberty when in the full maturity of life he confirms that former offering by his last vows. And by this complete abnegation and subordination of himself he becomes a more fit instrument in the hand of the Divine Majesty and more united with the Divine Worker. (Cf. Const. P. X n. 2)

13. While we live surrounded by the notions of the "humanism" of today, we must take care that we do not pass over in forgetfulness this true and fundamental meaning of religious

obedience or consider it of little worth. By obedience we are nailed with Christ to the Cross; by the Cross the world is saved.

14. As St. Ignatius has already warned us, (for the difficulties of today are really common to all times) we deceive ourselves if we believe that we are obedient when by deceit or stubborness we have brought our Superior to that which we ourselves desire. For it is one thing to set before the Superior sincerely and with full simplicity, after consulting with God, just what we ourselves think; it is quite another thing to discuss the matter with the Superior in the fashion of those who contend with another from opposing camps. For these attempt by their discussions to arrive at something acceptable to both, usually some middle ground; where as one who is truly obedient intends only to inform the Superior fully and rightfully, so that he may at length decide what seems to him to be the more prudent course of action.

15. Perhaps more difficult than obeying some individual command of the Superior is that general and daily obedience by which we are bound to keep a rule of life, submitting ourselves to religious discipline. This at times seems to us to be a kind of "formalism," which should be changed by reform in our time in order that a true law of "spontaneity" and love may rule.

16. We are forgetting two truths, I am afraid; one of reason, one of revelation. The natural truth we forget is that man is not one whom you can leave to his own devices, all of whose acts will be good and well done, provided that he is left to himself and may act as he pleases. We forget that in the wisdom of even the pagan world, man needs to have some control exercised over him, to conquer himself in many things, unless he wishes to become a slave of his own self-centeredness, and of pleasure, and a beast of prey to his fellow man. How many and what great acts of self-conquest do not some of the political parties of today exact of their followers, that they may serve the common and future good of the whole society of mankind? There is this difference between these men and ourselves, that we, knowing indeed that discipline is necessary for the good of the individual and of all, make use of fatherly persuasion to impose it; is it for that reason of any less worth? But the

revealed truth is indeed of far greater importance: as Our Lord redeemed the world by His Passion and Cross, so must His followers, by carrying their own cross, (cf. Luke 14, 27) make perfect His work of Redemption. And by the perpetual tradition of the Church, religious discipline is part of this cross, proposed to all of us and be carried by us all.

17. We who strive to cast off the yoke of this discipline, are we not casting off the garments and livery of Christ, Who was subject to His parents, to the Law of Moses, and to the will of His Father, to the complete renunciation of Himself? We who in our daily life refuse to bear the yoke in anything that displeases us, what shall we ever accomplish in the apostolic life?

18. Our young men do not always suspect how much of self abnegation, how much of humility and meekness and patience is required for the earnest ministry of souls. One who faithfully and without ceasing will have trained himself in these lowly virtues through the years of the hidden life, will easily apply them for the good of souls when he will enter the ministry. The Society in fact endeavors to prepare its subjects for intercouse with men and the pastoral life, from the noviceship to the third year of probation, using various means, and almost new ones from day to day. This indeed is required; but without the continuous practice of these "passive" virtues, as they are sometimes called, how often do the "active" virtues fall off into feverish activity that bears little fruit!

19. We rightly desire to ready ourselves for the serious problems of our day. But there are different duties in the Mystical Body of Christ. To some the Church has proposed the eremetical life, to others the monastic life, to still others the life of religious combined with the active apostolate, and to yet others, especially in the present day, a life in the world guided by the principles of religious life; and so with other forms of vocation. To us, in these very days and in our own age, the Church proposes the way of our Institute. Others may do other things and in other ways, with the approval of the Church; for us our own special duty rests upon us. Our Institute remains for us in our own day "the way to God," as St. Ignatius has said from the beginning.

20. If anything in the usage of the Society is really out-of-date, it will be changed by the Society itself in its own time

without any other trouble than supernatural prudence and wisdom require. How many things have I myself, in the life of one man, seen changed in this way! And if it is necessary to do more, more will be changed. But the very principle of religious discipline, which keeps anyone in Religion from rising and going to bed, from working and praying, keeping silence and speaking, going out and returning when and as he wishes, and not as it is enjoined or allowed to him—this principle, I say, will not be changed. The Church wishes the Society to remain what it is, a religious order, not a secular Institute or an apostolic society of any other kind. If anyone wishes anything different, let him not offer himself to the Society, but seek for himself some other form of serving God.

21. The inmost heart of our Founder and the very essence of his intention was of course to gain souls for Christ, to build the Body of Christ. He did not want us to be solitaries, and from the history of the early Society it is evident how much he struggled to prevent the desire of pure contemplation from withdrawing the minds of his sons from the apostolic life. But with a like firmness of will, he wished us to be Religious intensely devoted to a life of spiritual perfection, and this especially by the spirit deeply ingrained in every one, and by that restrained regular observance which is peculiar to our Institute.

22. Many have a well-intentioned desire to be "contemplatives in action," and plan to seek God in all things. But some falsely imagine that for this height of perfection it is enough to give oneself to activity with great energy, without thought of anything else.

23. It is one thing to devote one's self to action, another to be a contemplative in action. It is one thing to indulge in all kinds of activity, and something else to seek God alone therein. One will not be a contemplative in action unless he exercises himself long and solidly in contemplation; he will not seek God in every action unless he will have been habitually united with God by every kind of virtue, and especially by deep humility.

24. Who has ever doubted that the pastoral method suited to todays needs must be carefully examined, and if necessary revised, as indeed St. Ignatius himself teaches in that famous

passage of the Constitutions? (Const. P. X n. 3) [814]) Let Ours strive with all their strength to seek this out, but with wisdom, however, and with that humility without which we fall into presumption. Let us cast aside nothing because it is old, or take up anything because it is new, but acording to the advice of St. Paul: "prove all things, and hold fast to that which is good." (I Thes. 5, 21) That we may not trust too much to our own opinion, others before ourselves have considered the same matters, have studied the way of preaching the Gospel, have had problems very much like our own to solve, and have not always solved them wrongly. A good and wise father of a family "bringeth forth out of his treasure new things and old." (Matt. 13, 52) But among those older things of whose lasting value the Gospel gives us witness, are numbered those substantial qualities of the religious life which, with more ease than justice, we assert should be reformed, together with accidental characteristics. And to the very substance of religious life, especially in the Society, belongs that obedience which St. Ignatius described in the Constitutions. (Const. P. VI c. 1 [547-552])

25. If any difficulty remains for us, it will easily be removed, provided that our attitude toward the Superior is that which the Constiutions desire. Let the Superior for his part, as only recently I have again recommended to Superiors, conduct himself as a father, firm indeed but kind, who will love his sons, listen to them, have pity on them, and help them in every way to bear the yoke of the Lord. Let the subject for his part show a full trust and love for his Superior, in the manner of a son. As every human father, so every Superior has his own defects; but as every son who is noble in mind and well-bred ignores his father's faults and bears them patiently, refusing none of the love he owes his father, so the Religious fully worthy of the name likewise disregards the faults of the Superior with charity, endures them patiently, and does not because of them take away anything of the reverence and, so far as possible, of the affection which he ought to bear for him. This will easily be done if, as we have often been advised, we regard the man in our Superior not with merely human eyes, but in the spirit of faith, as one bearing the place of Christ the Lord. For it is not by a sort of pious and generally-used image of the mind

that we say the Superior puts on the person of Christ, but in real truth, if indeed he is appointed by the Vicar of Christ according to the mind of Christ to guide his religious subjects in fulfilling those evengelical counsels which Christ taught us by word and example.

26. This bond of filial obedience is, among other things, the principal bond of union and charity in the Society: "Union for the most part is achieved by the bond of obedience." (Const. P. VIII c. 1 n. 3 [659]) And if our obedience is that which is found in a real family, between a loving father and his loving sons, how easily will our communities become like a beginning of heaven on earth, free from the selfishness, the quarelling and the ill-will that rules in the world, preparing us for the perfect union in Christ.

I commend myself to the Holy Sacrifices and prayers of you all.

At Rome, on the Feast of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary, December the 8th, 1963.

The servant of all in Christ,

JOHN B. JANSSENS
General of the Society of Jesus.

A Letter of Very Reverend Father General To All Superiors*

Reverend Father in Christ:

Pax Christi!

Being on the point of writing to the whole Society on the virtues so dear to our holy Father Ignatius, humility and its handmaid obedience, from which true charity readily blossoms forth, I should wish first of all to share with Superiors a few thoughts from which the spiritual progress of subjects will to a great degree depend.

In the very beginning of the Constitutions, our holy Father calls to mind the principle from which our whole religious life depends; for he says: "The internal law of charity and love which the Holy Spirit is wont to write and imprint in the hearts of men is to help (to advance the Society in the service of God) rather than any external Constitutions." From this principle the whole plan of acting and of governing on the part of Superiors should proceed.

1. Before all else, therefore, we must take care "that they may go forward in the spirit of love and not with the perturbation of fear." (Const. P. VI c. 1 n. 1 [547]) And in order that subjects may so go forward, it is required that the Superior must have and keep before his mind a loving care for them. (Cf. Const. P. VIII c. 1 G [667]) His love for his subjects will flow forth freely from the love of God which the Superior will foster in himself by the constancy in prayer which the Institute prescribes, and by a true Ignatian "goodness" or sum of solid virtues, whether these be what we often call "human" virtues or the really supernatural ones which make one lovable to God and his fellow-man; and among these will be a humility

* A covering letter, subsequently extended to all of Ours, and read at table.

which is both simple and sincere, (Cf. Const. P. IX c. 2 n. 2 [725]) together with the charity which will flow from it.

2. Out of this genuine love of subjects will follow an earnest desire to lead and move them onward in the way of the Lord. If the subjects know that "the Superior knows how to govern them well in the Lord and is willing and able to do so," (Const. P. VIII c. 1 G [677]) that confidence will easily arise which opens the way to the union of souls and to a happy and steadfast obedience. Let not the Superior be one of those of whom it is said: "He does a great deal of work, but little governing." Let no work of zeal, however greatly it is to be commended, take precedence over a devoted care for governing subjects well, both in their own spiritual life and in their apostolic work. Let not any Rector or Provincial, or even the Superior of any lesser house, allow himself to be wholly occupied in the care of advancing studies, in winning the favor of external authority for his own house, in acquiring and maintaining friends and benefactors, in solving the economic problems of the house, in employing himself in the works of the ministry, but with detriment to the religious governing of his subjects. God the Creator and Redeemer of the souls of our subjects will exact an accounting from us on this before everything else.

3. Following the most ancient tradition of religious life, St. Ignatius wished above all else that between Superior and inferior there should exist that most intimate friendly relationship of a loving father and a trusting son by which the subject should keep "nothing secret (from his Superior), not even his own conscience." (Const. P. IV c. 10 n. 5 [424]) There is something lacking in a Superior who cannot win this confidence in himself on the part of his subjects. And that the subject may easily open up his soul to the Superior, it is certainly required that the latter should deserve this good opinion and authority for himself, (Cf. Const. P. VIII c. 1 G [667]) namely by his religious fidelity, and especially to duty and to prayer, by abnegation of self and worthiness of life. It is required also that the Superior should most faithfully observe the obligation of secrecy, never hinting to anyone, even to a higher Superior, anything which he may have learned from a manifestation of conscience or from any conversation of like nature, never using such acquired knowledge in any way other than

according to the norm of the Institute, (Epit. 204, No. 2 and No. 3) that is, while preserving the secrecy and with the consent of the subject, for his good or for the good of the Society and the Church. And in case of doubt, let the Superior be more rigid in observing secrecy than free in using the knowledge.

Nor should the Superior be one who out of a certain hesitation or timidity of mind would refuse to hear a manifestation of conscience and would send the subject to the Spiritual Father. As it is the duty of a priest never to refuse to hear anyone or anything in Confession, with the exception of very rare and entirely exceptional cases, so it is the duty of a Superior, if he is led by the true spirit of St. Ignatius, to listen to all his subjects on their intimate problems and to impart to them appropriate advice or whatever else charity may suggest.

When such a relationship exists between subjects and Superior, both the duty of commanding and the corresponding duty of obeying will become sweet and productive. And this is the intention of the Society, faithfully following our Founder; and this is the solution of not a few of our modern difficulties and what we call our problems.

4. Following the example of Christ, the Lord, Whose person he puts on, and being "always mindful of the pattern of Peter and Paul," (Formula of the Institute, n. 6) let those who are Superiors endeavor, so far as is in their power, "to give commands with circumspection and in good order," so that "the Superior may exercise as well as he can all kindness and modesty and charity in the Lord." (Const. P. VIII c. 1 G [667]) The fourth Rule of the Provincial recalls this norm of action with remarkable conciseness, recommending that he be moved by affection for his subjects; and, "by giving his commands with circumspection and modesty," "he may make himself worthy of their affection."

5. St. Ignatius advises that we should give our commands "with circumspection." And this circumspection, as is evident from the very etymology of the word, supposes that before we give a command, we shall have considered the matter under discussion from every angle, and shall have weighed the subject's powers of body and soul, which can scarcely be done

unless we shall have heard the opinion of many others. Let the Superior learn to listen kindly to the thinking of those subjects who are notable for prudence and experience, and in fact of all those who recourse to him. Nor may he easily disregard the younger or less-educated members as though lacking in experience and wisdom. How often does the Spirit reveal to "the lowly and the little ones" what He has not made known to "the prudent and the wise." (Cf. Matt. 11, 25) It easily happens that the younger and more humble may fully understand in a more direct and vivid manner the spirit of the Gospel which we perhaps have lost to some degree because of an habitual manner of life that is less generous to the Lord. Have we not known at times that salt has lost its savor? Indeed, let us not as a matter of course reject the opinion even of those who, with the rashness characteristic of the inexperienced, would wish to reform the Society and the Church. The Church and the Society always need reform, whether by advancing from good to better, or indeed by changing from evil to good. Let us not imitate those blinded souls who refused to listen to the voices of those uttering warning in due season, as the history of the Church affords abundant examples. On the contrary, let us be ready to listen willingly to the voices of many, proving all things indeed, and holding fast that which is good. (Cf. I Thess. 5, 21)

And if after their opinions have been heard, and especially the minds of those advisers whom the Church through the Society has given to us to be listened to, we shall see that there is solid opposition to our own opinion, let us humbly depart from our own idea which we have set forth, ready to embrace the better opinion of others. Let us call to mind just what we ourselves are, fallible men in sooth, and in so many matters so less skilled and knowledgeable than many of our subjects. How many of our Coadjutor Brothers there are who are far more skilled in their line of work than the Provincial himself or the General! The authority which is given to us by virtue of our office does not automatically bring with it knowledge or "competence" in every matter of business that must be handled.

6. Let one who is placed in authority give his commands "with modesty." Let us imitate the modesty of Christ in teaching and leading His disciples. How far was He from

that arrogant and harsh manner with which lesser officials in the world are wont to exercise their authority! Should not the lowliest Novice be to us, not by any pious fiction but in very truth, a son by adoption of the Eternal Father, the brother of Christ the Lord, the living temple of the Holy Spirit worthy of the highest veneration? Whom have we dared to name that does not excel us in natural talent, in virtue, in humility especially, and in purity of heart? How many souls that are despised in the world will shine in Paradise with a far greater glory than those who to human sight appear wise and prudent? If we shall regard our subjects with a true appraisal of their worth, with reverence, and so with a humble love in Christ, surely it will always be easy for us to give our commands "with modesty," without any pride or any harshness. Would that this spirit of faith were not so lacking in our usual and daily life!

7. But while St. Ignatius wishes us to give our commands with circumspection and modesty, it should be so that we shall still be "in authority." And I fear lest we may very often err in this matter, to the detriment of the good of our subjects and of the souls entrusted to them, and of the filial trust which we ought to secure for ourselves.

Rightly do we emphasize that "governing in the Society should be paternal." But not infrequently we err in defining what it is to act in a paternal way toward subjects. Does he act in a fatherly way who does not warn his sons sincerely when they are in danger or are going astray, who grants to his sons whatever pleases them and not what is for their good? Does a father of a family act in a fatherly way when he allows his sons, whether they be great or small, to do whatever they wish? Does not Wisdom Itself warn us in the Holy Scripture: "He who spares the rod, hates his son"? (Prov. 13, 24) Did not the Lord cast away from Himself the priest Heli, who did not effectively correct his sons? When Peter spoke in the manner of men, did not Christ chide him: "Get thee behind Me, Satan!"? (Mk., 8, 33) Did not St. Paul warn Timothy, his disciple and fellow-bishop: "Reprove, entreat, rebuke . . ."? (2 Tim. 4, 2) Does not the Church, the spouse of the Holy Spirit, not only warn and rebuke wrong-doers, but even curb them with punishments? And so St. Ignatius wisely warns the

General that he should "mingle righteousness and a necessary severity with kindness and meekness;" (Cf. Const. P. IX c. 2 n. 4 [727]) that he should not allow himself to be separated by the entreaties or threats of even the great and the mighty from that which the greater service of God seems to require. (Cf. ibid. n. 5 [728]) Let all Superiors apply this to themselves in their own circumstances. No one can be said to govern in a fatherly way who refuses to be firm for the good of subjects, and indeed severe, when necessary.

In truth, this firm manner of governing, provided that it be thoroughly combined with the other qualities mentioned, will do most to win the trust and love of inferiors for the Superior. A manner of governing that is hesitant, indefinite, and indecisive is unsatisfactory to them, since the subject can always be rebuked afterward for not having obeyed, for not rightly interpreting the mind of the Superior, for acting imprudently. Let the Superior take full responsibility upon himself. Let him never speak in language that is not clear. If perchance he should make a mistake, let him and not the innocent subject incur the blame. If the Superior has erred in good faith, he will have merit in the sight of God; if he has acted imprudently, he will suffer the penalty therefor; if he has knowingly done wrong, he will not escape the judgment of the Almighty. But the subject, if he has been humble in his obedience, will be adjudged innocent.

Nor should the Superior, if he has something to command which is hard to accept, throw the odium thereof upon a higher Superior: "This is what Father Provincial wants," or "Father General." For subjects know that it is a characteristic of an ignoble and selfish nature to avert dislike from one's self to make it fall upon another. In this matter, also, let the Local Superior assume his full responsibility; and if the discipline has perchance failed, let him restore it by his own authority and enforce the Rule by his own authority. He will win a greater appraisal of his worthiness than if it should appear he does not have the courage to do his duty.

As my illustrious predecessor, Father Wlodimir Ledochowski, has already reminded us, we have great need in the Society today of Superiors who are well able to combine firmness with kindness and mercy. I can reveal it to his credit that the 28th

Decree of the 28th General Congregation, on the Duties of Superiors, (Coll. Decr. [121]) was prepared at his suggestion and almost in his very words(*)

8. It is a serious obligation of Superiors to take care to the limit of their ability that religious discipline be kept intact, so far as human weakness makes it possible. It is a common opinion of theologians that even if the subject in violating the Rule does not by that very fact commit sin, (Cf. Const. P. VI c. 5 [602]) nevertheless the Superior who allows the observance of the Rule to become relaxed incurs culpability in conscience; for it is through his fault that subjects are deprived of that help in attaining the perfection of charity which is found in the common fidelity of all. If through the negligence of Superiors the common life and in like manner the example and words of many are an obstacle or at least no help to the spiritual fervor and progress of the rest, it is easy to understand that the Lord will exact an accounting from the one upon whom rests by virtue of his office the obligation of caring for the regular common life. More than once it happens that when some one is to be dismissed from the Society,

---

(*) C. G. XXVIII d. 28 121 *On the Duties of Superiors.* Let both major and local Superiors remember that the preservation and increase of the spirit of the Society depends to a very great extent upon themselves, relying always on the grace of Almighty God and Our Lord, Jesus Christ; wherefore let them devote themselves wholly to the exercise of their duty, let them understand well the rules of their office and take care to observe them, let them assist and direct their subjects in all things and in correcting them when there is need, "let them so mingle righteousness and severity with kindness and meekness that they will not allow themselves to be swayed from whatever they may have judged to be more pleasing to God and Our Lord; and at the same time let them know how to have a sympathetic understanding with their sons, as is fitting, conducting themselves in such a way that even those who are subject to reproof or correction, although the action taken may be displeasing according to the lower side of human nature, will nevertheless recognize that the Superiors are doing their duty rightly and with charity in the Lord."

rather than the culprit, it is his Superior who should be punished, who pretended that he was unaware of his subjects' leaving the house even by night, who forebore to open their letters out of human respect, who easily granted them permission to make journeys that were not necessary, who did not block the beginning of a bad custom, who did not warn one who was in danger, who was content to abdicate his own responsibility by informing a higher Superior while he himself neglected to be watchful and to take action.

On the other hand, how great is the power of a good Superior to help his subjects in the spirit, provided that he does not refuse to listen to a sincere account of conscience but indeed agreeably assists in it, while he establishes in the community a general atmosphere in which subjects are urged to keep the Rules with alacrity and willingness! Surely that is a most precious art, which should be sought and obtained from the Lord by continuous prayer.

The burden of governing will be lightened and at the same time the peace of souls will be advanced by reason of a uniform manner of acting in the various houses and Provinces if the Superior by continuous reading and application shall strive to know the Institute of the Society and the treasures of wisdom, experience, and "dynamism" to be found therein. Beyond all the parts of the Institute, surely the Constitutions are the most important; for greater convenience of use, the Epitome presents the inmost spirit of the Institute, whether of the Constitutions themselves, or of the Decrees of the Congregations, or of the Ordinations of the Generals. Is it not a certain special part of the "Consideration" recommend to Superiors that they shall re-read the Epitome and at the same time note down in writing the matters which perhaps leave something to be desired in their execution and may need to be enforced?

9. The Superior will answer, not only concerning the religious life within his walls, but concerning the whole apostolic activity of his subjects. Not that he can, by the very nature of things, make all the decisions on everything (how many inferiors know many more things and know them better than their Superiors!) nor especially that everything must begin from himself (how many excellent works have been promoted in the Church and the Society, with the approval indeed of

the Superior, but conceived and begun by the subject!). The Sodalities of Our Lady, the Apostleship of Prayer, the work of colleges of externs, some great and flourishing foreign missions, and so many other works—have not these had their beginnings in the initiative, the vision, and the efforts of some subject?

It is the Superior's duty to listen to men who are skilled in such matters, men among his subjects and others, and then to approve, to direct, and to coordinate the apostolic activity, just as St. Ignatius was wont to do, who used to leave much to the discretion of his subjects, but often at the same time supported them with those Instructions, of which many have been preserved and have now been published.

10. If our holy Father was wont to say freely that "Discretion is not taught at Salamanca," that famous university of his time, it is fiitting for us, too, to remember that the practical wisdom which is necessary in every endeavor, and in an especial manner in the exercise of religious authority, is not taught by instructions, letters, and exhortations. The light of the Holy Spirit is required. Hence it happens that this must be considered as the first among the duties of the Superior, that he must carry the house and the community, indeed the Province or the Mission entrusted to him, upon his prayers and good desires as upon his shoulders. (Cf. Const. P. IV c. 10 n. 5 424) Our daily and unbroken prayer, and the prayer of all Superiors, should be that taken from the Book of Wisdom (Wis. 9, 4) : "Give me, O Lord, wisdom that sitteth by Thy throne, that it may be with me and may labor with me, and that I may always know what is acceptable in Thy sight." "Ask and it shall be given to you," and the Lord will not refuse His good Spirit to those who humbly ask Him. (Cf. Luke 11, 9 and 13)

11. Let it be a comfort to all our Superiors that if they are faithful, they are leading a life that is most pleasing to God; indeed they are sanctifying themselves more easily than can their subjects. For out of their obedience, which is the sacrifice of their own will and all their own convenience, they are exercising unending fraternal charity—"As long as ye have done it to one of these My least brethren, ye have done it unto Me;" (Matt. 25, 40) they are forced to expend all their time, their

strength, their labors, not for their own desires, but for the desires of their subjects; they truly live, not for themselves, but for Him Who died and rose from the dead for them. (Cf. 2 Cor. 5, 15) Rightly and deservedly can they expect that at length they will hear: "Well done, thou good servant . . . because thou has been faithful over a few things . . . enter into the joy of thy Lord." (Matt. 25, 23)

I commend myself to your most Holy Sacrifices.

At Rome, on the 8th of December, 1963, on the Feast of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary.

Your Reverence's servant in Christ,

JOHN B. JANSSENS
General of the Society of Jesus

A Symposium

Jesuits and Catholic Students in American Higher Education

Paul C. Reinert
Theodore V. Purcell
Vincent T. O'Keefe
Charles A. Frankenhoff
Patrick A. Donohue
John A. Hardon
David J. Bowman

Robert Fitzgerald (ed.)

INTRODUCTION

According to a statistical projection made by R. J. Clifford, S.J. and W. R. Callahan, S.J. of Weston College there will be 2,900,000 Catholic students in college in 1985.[1] *Of these 80% (2,360,000) will be in non-Catholic colleges. The report goes on to note that in 1962 34% of the Catholic students enrolled in Catholic colleges were in Jesuit schools. This represented 12.5% of the Catholic students enrolled in all institutions of higher learning. By 1985 the Jesuit schools would have had to increase their present enrollment by 60% of the 1962 enrollment in order to retain 34% of the Catholic college enrollment. However, even at this rate of expansion, Jesuit enrollment in 1985 would represent only 6.7% of the Catholic students enrolled in all institutions of higher learning.*

Clearly, with 80% of the Catholic student body on secular campuses in 1985, the secular university campus will be playing a highly significant role in determining the intellectual climate and quality of the American Catholic Church at the

[1] Based on Sidney G. Tickton's *Letter to a College President*, The Fund for Advancement of Education, N.Y., 1963.

conclusion of this century. The Church, it seems, would profit immeasurably from formal and explicit representation before the ever-increasing proportion of American Catholic youth found on the campuses of secular universities. Indeed, the Church would be well served by such representation before all American youth on those campuses. Perhaps this witness-role could be played effectively, even brilliantly, by a Jesuit who is a qualified expert in some specialized field and a competent theologian and philosopher as well.

To phrase the problem in the form of specific questions we would ask: What kind of impact on the faculty and student body of a secular institution would be made by an academically certified Jesuit instructor in physics, philosophy, English, theology? If the Society were to allow some qualified men to go to the secular institutions, would such a decision undermine our own Jesuit efforts? Would such a decision be understood by Catholics as a compromise of our own Catholic system in any way?

In such a context we asked Jesuits who had taught or were teaching in secular institutions as well as three Jesuit university Presidents the question: "Should a qualified Jesuit aspire to an academic position at a secular university?" The following pages give their reply.

ROBERT FITZGERALD, S.J.

I. JESUIT HIGHER EDUCATION TODAY: A DISCUSSION

PAUL C. REINERT, S.J.

YOU HAVE ASKED ME to discuss this question: "Should a qualified Jesuit aspire to an academic position at a secular university?"

The Opportunity

On the assumption that this is an open question, the answer to which has not already been settled by higher superiors, I shall attempt a fairly brief reply. First, let me state that the intellectual apostolate on the American secular campus is undoubtedly one which is desperately needed and one which has been relatively neglected up to the present. With the favorable

climate created by the Ecumenical Movement, it is likely that a capable Jesuit scholar could wield a very deep and far-reaching influence if he were allowed to participate as a full-fledged faculty member of one of our leading secular institutions of higher learning. However, I would emphasize the notion that such a Jesuit scholar would have to be a full-fledged faculty member in a department in a secular institution, since the dynamics of the departmental situation (e.g. personalities, promotions, grants and contracts, etc.) would radically affect his potential contributions and influence. We cannot, in my opinion, base our estimates of this aspect of the situation on the felicitous circumstances encountered by those Jesuits who have been visiting professors or lecturers on some of the secular campuses.

I would also agree that this kind of apostolate would seem to follow the principles laid down by St. Ignatius and the Constitutions of the Society for the achievement of our objectives. Throughout the Society's history, outstanding Jesuits have pioneered in bold attacks on areas of opposition or indifference hitherto untouched by Catholic doctrine and influence. I see nothing in our traditions or regulations contrary to this type of apostolate.

The Goal

The answer to your question, therefore, it seems to me, is reduced to an application of another very clear-cut Ignatian principle. Among various effective means possible for the achievement of our objectives, we are supposed to choose that particular instrumentality most conducive to the greater glory of God and the good of our fellow men. One instrumentality towards this basic objective to which the American Assistancy has obviously committed itself is that of Jesuit higher education presently consisting of a network of 28 colleges and universities. The Jesuit Presidents at the conclusion of their recent annual meeting gave added emphasis to this point with the following statement:

> "As was developed at some length in the Loyola, Los Angeles, Workshop (August, 1962), the Presidents are convinced that Catholic colleges and universities in the United States are charged with a unique and critically important apostolate. Although the intellectual apostolate must be pursued on many fronts, nevertheless, the essen-

> tial contribution to the Catholic Church and to American Society which is the prerogative of Catholic Colleges and Universities cannot be achieved equally effectively, for example, by Catholic educational endeavors on the campuses of secular institutions. This fact must be kept in mind when priorities in Jesuit higher education are being established."

To assume that these twenty-eight institutions are achieving our objectives to the maximum degree of effectiveness and that, therefore, we should feel free to choose and develop other instrumentalities for achieving our objectives in higher education would be completely contrary to the fact. I know of no Jesuit college or university whose administration and faculty is convinced that they are even close to the achievement of their declared goals and actual potential.

The Problem

As we analyze reasons for failure to achieve our higher educational goals completely, a number of basic factors emerge:

1. Like so many other colleges and universities, we lack enough financial resources to provide the number and caliber of lay faculty and facilities necessary for our purposes;

2. Equally, if not more important, however, is the fact that to date we lack a sufficient number of highly trained professionally competent Jesuit scholars who would be in a position to exert the influence we need both within and outside the institution of which they are a faculty member.

Why this supply is lacking and what should be done about it is an extremely important question but not immediately relevant to the question you have asked me to answer. The pertinent point is that *de facto* the supply is lacking at the present time. This lack of an essential ingredient to achieve our objectives in Jesuit higher education in this country, namely, an insufficient number of highly trained Jesuit scholars —points the way to my answer to your question. If all of our 28 institutions, particularly the five or six universities among them who could become first-rate university centers, are now prevented from being so because of the lack of a sufficient number of Jesuit scholars, how can we justify further dilution of this supply by diverting it to secular campuses? Before giving an authoritative answer to the question asked, it would

seem to me that higher superiors should give or seek an authoritative answer to the question: "What precisely are the objectives of Jesuit higher education in America, and how are these objectives to be secured by the 28 Jesuit colleges and universities singly and collectively?" This question cannot be answered unless a detailed plan for the organic growth of our colleges and universities is developed with the help and advice of those in the Assistancy who are best qualified by experience and background to develop such a plan. Once developed, this plan would need the authoritative approval of higher superiors and the whole-hearted backing of American Jesuits generally with the conviction that this is a goal which is extremely important and which can and must be achieved.

Conclusion

When the happy day arrives that our present commitments in Jesuit higher education are achieving their maximum potential, then I can see no reason why it would not be most appropriate and most logical for us to enter the field of the intellectual apostolate on the secular campus. There is so much that we American Jesuits can and should do *now* to hasten the dawn of the happy day!

II. JESUIT HIGHER EDUCATION AND THE SECULAR UNIVERSITY APOSTOLATE

THEODORE V. PURCELL, S.J.

BY OUR JESUIT UNIVERSITY APOSTOLATE, American Jesuits have made a unique contribution to the modern Church. But the hard facts of demography and economics force us to reassess some aspects of this apostolate.

The Educational Prospect

About 66% of all Catholics in American universities now attend secular universities. This percentage will very likely go higher. (Federal aid coming to both private and public colleges, would probably not affect this trend.) Conservative projections show that by 1984, 80% of all Catholics will attend secular universities. Some of the most able Catholic students

are and will inevitably be attracted to the prestige institutions such as those of the Ivy League and other major private and state universities. While we also attract some outstanding students to our own universities, by far the growing majority of Catholic leadership *potential* will be in the secular universities. Therefore, we may have the paradox of the American Jesuit Order growing in numbers but declining in influence.

We Jesuits are surely concerned about the faith of the 66 to 80 percent of Catholic college students in secular universities as well as about the faith of the Protestants and Jews there. As an apostolic order, we shall hardly say: Let the Bishops worry about them! Moreover, we wish to Christianize American culture, as far as possible. But if the influential bulk of Catholic university graduates is to be formed in a non-Christian, secular way, they will not help in this Christianization process, and they may offset the work of our own universities. We cannot do everything. But it is good from time to time, to re-examine our criteria for undertaking or excluding an apostolate. Why should we consider the secular university apostolate?

The Jesuit-Scholar's Influence

A priest-scholar or priest-scientist can have a considerable effectiveness on the secular campus. Permit me to speak briefly about my own experiences as Tucker Visiting Lecturer at Dartmouth College.[2] I had excellent opportunities for influencing the students. But I also spent much of my time with the faculty. By attending dinners, receptions, department meetings, coffee sessions at faculty houses, on Main Street or at the Hanover Inn, I came to know about two-thirds of the Dartmouth faculty. Just because I wore two hats we would often discuss the issues of science and religion, of Catholic philosophy and theology. Many of these people had never talked to a priest-professor before. For my own part, I was greatly stimulated by my Dartmouth colleagues to do fresh thinking about my own philosophical and theological positions.

To borrow the economics concept of "marginal utility," one priest in such a milieu has a high marginal utility, if he com-

[2] Reported in "Jesuit at Dartmouth," *America*, April 20, 1963; Vol. 108, No. 16.

bines ability with scarcity. Jesuit administrators stress the importance of strategically placing one able Jesuit scholar-leader or scholar-teacher in each department of our universities. (This idea is one of the position-statements of the Loyola JEA Workshop.) One truly outstanding scholar-leader or scholar-teacher can influence the rest of his department and give it a Jesuit and Catholic tone, even though there are no other Jesuits in that department. If this is true for the department of a Jesuit university, how much more is it true for a department of a secular university. Such a scholar cannot create a total Catholic university atmosphere. But his influence for good can be most extensive within his *department* of the secular university. His marginal utility is high.

The Church's Witness

There is need for Catholic witness on the secular campus. While the secular university of today is not often anti-religious, it is usually saturated with implicit but pervasive secularism and pelagianism. It is true that some professors, especially social scientists, are finding a new interest in "values." Yet one study[3] showed that only 29% of the American Sociological Society members clearly believed in a personal God. The central importance of Jesus Christ and His Church, the theology of grace and man's need for sacraments and prayer are ignored by most professors. The resulting impact on the student is that science and secular humanism are all that matter.

Catholic professors are a tiny minority on the campuses of the top fifty American secular universities. About three percent of the Dartmouth faculty are practicing Catholics; but about three percent are fallen-away Catholics. At the University of Chicago, about two percent are Catholic. (One estimate puts nearly a third of the faculty as Jewish.) At Harvard, the Catholic percentage may be a little higher, perhaps five or six percent. The priest-scholar is still less in evidence around the typical university community. A well-known Harvard professor recently said: "I never see a priest (although he lives in the Catholic Boston area) except the priest-students I have in my courses."

[3] "What the Sociologists Believe," Clement S. Mihanovich, *America*, November 26, 1949, Vol. 82, No. 8.

It is not fair to say that professors in Catholic universities live in an intellectual ghetto. Such scholars have constantly improving academic relations with their colleagues in secular universities. To take a few examples, Catholic participation in the meetings of learned societies for economics, psychology and sociology has greatly quickened. Nevertheless, by being in a secular university, the Catholic scholar gains important new relationships with his secular colleagues by the give and take of department meetings, by joint or related research and by the social-intellectual life of the university *community*. The word ghetto does not have an all-or-none connotation; it admits degrees of contact. But at least in the daily give-and-take of the secular university community, the Catholic scholar is virtually missing, a condition curiously like that of the foreign missions.[4]

There are indirect benefits open to our 28 Jesuit universities by having a few Jesuit scholars on a secular campus. Such Jesuits could improve the image of Jesuit education in the eyes of secular scholars. They could help to recruit secular scholars for our own universities. They could improve relations between Jesuit and secular faculties for related research and for participation in annual meetings.

If it is said that Jesuits in the secular university apostolate would reach less than 1 percent of the Catholic students and thus offer no real solution to the problem of the 66 to 80%, one can answer that if we reach just 1% of the *best* lay leadership among both faculty and students in one or two of our best secular universities, we are actually having a great influence over American intellectual and public life.

Finally, better Catholic witness on the secular campus can also tap potential religious and priestly vocations. Although our statistics are sketchy, studies of three universities (Louisiana State University, Yale University and Dartmouth College) show that the work of just one or two priests eventuates in about one vocation per year per institution. The marginal

---

[4] We now send qualified Jesuits to universities in Korea, Nigeria, Taiwan, etc., despite the need for these men in our 28 American universities. Could it be just as important to send Jesuits to the "missions" of Berkeley, Harvard and Chicago—institutions greatly influencing leaders not only in America but in Asia, South America and Africa?

utility idea suggests that the investment of just a few Jesuits in the secular university apostolate might give a disproportionate increase in vocations to the Society. And many of these vocations will involve mature and solidly tried young men.

A Recommendation

What can American Jesuits do regarding the secular university apostolate? My recommendation is for a small, experimental effort on one or a few secular campuses with a few Jesuits as priest-professors. In recent years at least fifteen or twenty Jesuits have been visiting professors with full faculty status at various American secular universities, and Jesuit graduate students have lectured and conducted classes there. In my judgment, most of these, especially the younger men, could secure permanent appointments at one or another major secular university. Priest-professors have had regular appointments at Oxford, Cambridge, Paris and in Germany, Italy, Puerto Rico, Africa, Asia. (In certain Asian and African countries, Jesuit higher superiors, as I understand it, have opposed the establishment of Catholic universities but rather have encouraged our men to enter the secular universities there.)

A Jesuit group-center or institute in relation to a secular university is another possibility. I am not suggesting a college such as St. Michael's College at Toronto or a house like Campion Hall at Oxford, though these deserve study. Finally, we should explore, together with Protestants and Jews, means for restoring theology to an important place on the secular campus. Possibly the three-faith school of religion at the University of Iowa could be multiplied about the country. Possibly some other approach would be better. This is not the place to give details as to how the Society might experimentally enter the secular university apostolate, which of the above methods might be stressed or how many men might be involved. Here I simply point out the need and the great opportunity.

Jesuit Problems and A Solution

Whatever the need, can the Society do anything about it, considering the requirements of our own universities and our shortage of men and money? In my opinion, the possibility of the secular apostolate must be related to our Jesuit philosophy

of education and especially to our long-range planning for Jesuit higher education in the United States.

Let us make the assumption (not hard to deduce from contemporary behavior) that Jesuit higher education in America must necessarily be an ever expanding operation, not in new institutions but in swelling student enrollments and lay faculty, often without Jesuit manpower, and especially in expanding graduate degree-programs and professional schools. ("We must expand or perish. It would be good if we had the Jesuits, but with or without Jesuits, we must expand.") Under this assumption we cannot justify much work in the secular university apostolate. Even one qualified Jesuit withdrawn from an omnivorous expanding system for the secular apostolate would weaken a system already stretched thin.

All American higher education is now in a state of very rapid change, pushing towards both more years and more complexity of education, and giving the university greater influence over our entire national life than ever before. The Society of Jesus must take its rightful place in such a scene. The issue is not whether Jesuits should be in higher education. The issue is how *extensively* should we be committed? How *many* major university-centers should the Society attempt to run?

We are presently committed to eight universities and twenty smaller colleges with several of the latter expanding and pressing towards becoming full universities. The question can be cogently raised whether we are (or will be in the foreseeable future) equipped to run more than one outstanding major university-center in the United States, or at most two. Let us set up the plausible objective of two outstanding universities and two outstanding colleges. (We recall that several non-Jesuit Catholic universities, especially Notre Dame and Catholic University, are *also* seeking university-center status and are competing with us for faculty, students and funds.) Can we not strive for excellence in two Jesuit universities and two liberal arts colleges, with planned containment or even some retrenchment for the others? If we fail to do this, do we not fall into the danger of multiplying mediocrity and building ourselves away from the mainstream of Catholic lay leadership?

Let us make another assumption, however, that we Jesuits will undertake consolidation and containment of our universities, with retrenchment for some of them, that is, at least for some programs in some of them. Under this assumption, a coexisting, limited and experimental apostolate among secular universities is possible. Consolidation could give us excellence, but would also permit the freeing of a *limited number* of Jesuits for the secular university apostolate without serious dilution of the manpower needed for Jesuit universities.

Containment and consolidation will come, in my opinion, only from Rome. Because of the disunified administration of the American Assistancy with 39 practical, if not juridical jurisdictions (11 Provincials and 28 university Presidents), cooperation involving real local loss for one institution to advance the good of all seems impossible. Assistancy-wide planning (praised so often, these last 20 years), if it means anything, means restriction or control in one Jesuit college of its courses, or faculty or students or funds for the good of another, or for the good of all. Even given breadth of vision and the best of good will, local pressures will surely prevent this.

Only if the Assistancy has a juridically unified government, under an American Vicar-General perhaps, does national planning seem possible. Such unified government might conceivably be set up by the next General Congregation. There are many demands for it, from diverse Jesuit interests.

This government would involve a change (though not substantial) in our Jesuit Constitutions. Centralized power would have to be prudently used. An American Vicar-General would need expert advice for national planning from qualified and experienced Jesuit university administrators, scholars and teachers. But thanks to such a government, planning would not be merely talk. It could be implemented.

It is a great achievement that Jesuits have played a leading role in American higher education by preserving and developing the religiously committed university. But we face a turning point in our path. We can continue to expand. Or we can consolidate and reinforce our system to one or two excellent universities, and one or two first-rate liberal arts colleges, with contained respectability for the others.

If we follow the latter path we shall be free to turn ourselves,

in small but influential part, to the urgent apostolate of the secular university. How far we can go in this new apostolate is not clear now. But we must have the flexibility to experiment. Such flexibility is a special Ignatian mark of the Society. Let us exercise it!

III. ISSUES AND QUESTIONS

VINCENT O'KEEFE, S.J.

AN INFORMED JUDGMENT on the idea of qualified Jesuits in academic positions at secular universities is a difficult one because it involves a number of issues and questions. These issues and questions call for expert and prolonged discussion. I should like to indicate briefly some of these issues and questions.

The Jesuit University

The finality of our Jesuit higher education is obviously a key factor. One treatment of this may be found in the *Proceedings of the Colloquium on Jesuit Higher Education* held at Alma College, California in 1962. Ultimately, it is the destiny of the Catholic university to bear witness to the Incarnation of the Son of God. Despite the many other needs of the Church, and the heavy financial burden a university imposes, and the relatively small percentage of Catholic youth who can attend it, the destiny of the Catholic university is its own justification. It stands there as a symbol and sign that the Son of God really entered our human history and that in so doing He sanctified all truth, the truth of science and technology as well as that of scripture and tradition. Theologically, the university gives proof that the Church is concerned with the totality of human living. The Catholic university is the intellectual presence of Christ and His Church in the world today.

Another factor which needs careful evaluation is the contribution of our Jesuit colleges and universities. Unfortunately, relatively few people, including our own Jesuits, are aware of the scope and quality of the programs in our institutions, of their relationships with other institutions, and of the contribution made to the local community and to the community at

large. Here we are dealing with a very important factor which both needs and deserves close attention.

The projected contribution of our Jesuit institutions is connected with the direction of higher education in America. Father Michael Walsh, S.J. of Boston College and Father Robert Henle, S.J. of St. Louis University have written thoughtful contributions on this. Father Walsh has pointed out: "Never in history has there been an educational institution so involved in the life of its time and so powerful to shape its time as the modern American university. Unless there is significant and first-class Catholic participation in top-level university activity, then the Mystical Body of Christ will be deprived of a voice in this most critical area of leadership." In a frankly pluralistic world, the Catholic university is needed more than ever both for the individual and for society.

Our modern, unique educational institution which is the modern American university or the university center presents unique opportunities. Father Henle has indicated that it is the source of strongest potential leadership and influence. From the university centers and through them government, business, industry, all the fields of learning, states and communities, international organizations and activities will be formed, shaped and directed. The Society of Jesus has the opportunity to establish these centers of highest leadership and tremendous influence. This may well be an opportunity unlike any the Society has ever had before.

Another factor to be considered is the role of the layman which is one of full participation in our total educational endeavor. The number of laymen teaching theology in our own institutions is increasing steadily. With a number of institutions now offering a doctoral program in theology and the sacred sciences, more and more laymen will choose theology as their teaching field and will be equipped to teach in both Catholic and non-Catholic institutions. This could mean a tremendous impact on secular campuses. The lay theologian will no longer be so unusual.

Actual and projected cooperative endeavors between Jesuit institutions and with other institutions must be considered. In addition to practices which now link our institutions with secular institutions, the possibility of servicing courses at

nearby schools needs exploring, v.g. the Department of Theology at Fordham might offer courses at New York University, Columbia, etc.

Jesuits on the Secular Campus

One question to be answered clearly and carefully is the finality of placing Jesuits on secular campuses. How many Jesuits would be involved and on which campuses? If only a few Jesuits are to be considered for this, it seems preferable that they be attached to one of our own universities as is done now. If a larger number of Jesuits are to be involved, the problem becomes a very serious one. The men would have to be highly qualified and armed with the necessary degrees. Acceptance on the faculties of secular universities would not be automatic. These men would have to struggle through the various grades of promotion with the necessary good teaching, research, publication and committee work involved before acquiring tenure. It would be some time before they exercised a real influence within their own department and an even longer time within the university.

Given the number and quality of the men needed for such an endeavor, and given the commitments we already have to our own colleges and universities, there would not be enough qualified Jesuits to satisfy both demands. Siphoning off our Jesuit manpower to the secular universities in sufficient numbers would call for the prior decision to dismantle our Jesuit higher education.

Given the wonderful opportunity open to our Jesuit institutions, my judgment is that Fordham University would be looking for the same men who would be picked for the secular universities. There are not and will not be enough of these men available to do serious work on secular campuses and to staff Fordham with the men needed to take advantage of the unique opportunity presented to us. In my judgment the latter work would be the greater good.

IV. JESUIT PRODUCTIVITY AND THE SECULAR UNIVERSITY

CHARLES A. FRANKENHOFF, S.J.

OUR PROBLEM is the relationship between the Jesuit educational apostolate and the secular university. There is no need here to review the Society's general commitment to university-level education. Our question is simply, Does this commitment include the campus and classroom of the secular university?

In the analysis of this paper we wish to suggest that: (1) there are quantitative and qualitative limits to Jesuit university growth; (2) the Jesuit educational apostolate need not be limited to Jesuit institutions; (3) other educational alternatives are available to fulfill the objectives of Jesuit higher education.

Growth Problems

In the spring semester of 1964 there were perhaps 4.5 million students in the nation's colleges and universities. Statistically, this number is expected to double within ten years.[5]

[5] Educational statistics and their projections vary. Reasonable changes in the data used here would not prejudice the analysis nor its conclusions.

One consequence of this growth of the demand for a university education, a recent Ford Foundation Report indicated, is the relative decline of private colleges. In 1950, some 50% of the nation's university student body was in private colleges. This proportion had fallen to 35% in 1964 and is expected to decline to 20% of the total student enrollment by 1985. The full significance of this decline in terms of attendance at Jesuit universities remains unclear, but it seems reasonable to assume that the Jesuit share of the college student body, presently over 2%, will decrease. University costs per student are now increasing at a rate which will tend to force the typical Jesuit university, poorly endowed and without substantial public funds, to de-accelerate its growth.

Quite apart from any supply and demand analysis on a quantitative basis, the Jesuit university has certain qualitative goals which tend to limit its growth. In his well-known letter, *Concerning Our Ministries,* Very Reverend Father General Janssens has reminded us that "The objective of our colleges

is to form Catholic men who by example and influence can be guides to others." This formation, he emphasizes, is not merely a matter of piety and of good morals, nor of membership in Catholic Action organizations. It is an integral formation in which the Jesuit college graduate can function effectively and responsibly within his community.

> It is absolutely necessary that they be so outstanding also in learning, practicality and other human endowments that their cooperation is rated very high by everyone . . . so that men have recourse by preference to them when something, even of a public character, needs doing.

It is in terms of this objective that we can understand Father General's wish that the majority of the teachers in any college be Jesuits. It is in terms of this same set of goals that we can understand his expressed "fear" over the increasing numbers of students in our colleges and universities.

Jesuit Productivity Ratios

The concept of Jesuit University productivity is relatively undeveloped. One ratio commonly used to judge the educational potential of a university is the ratio between faculty and students. On the assumption that the S.J. faculty student ratio is one good measure of Jesuit productivity we can ask what kind of ratio reflects the formation potential which justifies the existence of a Jesuit educational institution? In Fordham, for example, some 10,000 students are being taught by approximately 125 Jesuits, a ratio of 80:1. In St. Peter's College, 2500 students are being taught by 40 Jesuits, a ratio of 60:1. Are these ratios satisfactory? Could they be doubled and still be satisfactory? What is the minimum level of Jesuit productivity, the level which permits us "to form Catholic men who by example and influence can be guides to others"?

This question cannot be answered generally, but only in terms of a specific university. It is a useful question, however, because it implies that the Jesuit university has certain goals which cannot be achieved without a minimum "mix" of Jesuits. It is also obvious that these goals cannot be achieved without student material of a certain quality, professors (including Jesuits) of a certain professional calibre, and adequate physical and library facilities. In economic terms, the Jesuit university

needs a certain minimum investment of Jesuits per student, of faculty per student, of capital facilities per student. To establish this minimum is difficult; to ignore its existence is necessarily to distort the objectives of our educational apostolate.

Turning briefly to the question of the supply of Jesuits which will be available for university work: what is the ratio between new vocations and the Jesuit faculty member? For analytical purposes let us assume—a high figure—that 20 university faculty members are produced by every 100 Jesuit vocations which persevere. Assuming that out of 120 entrants, 100 will persevere, then we need 120 entrants into the novitiate to produce 20 S.J. faculty members, or a ratio of 6:1. Applying this ratio to the current New York Province rate of 40 new vocations annually, we can project some six new Jesuit faculty members annually. On the basis of St. Peter's Jesuit productivity ratio of 60:1, this addition would support an approximate, annual increase of 400 college students in the Province. This projection assumes (1) that the existing ratio is satisfactory, and (2) that together with the increase in Jesuit faculty there will be a proportionate increase in lay faculty and in physical facilities.

If this productivity perspective is valid, there would seem very little ground for hoping that the Jesuit universities will be able to care for their share of the growing Catholic student body. (For simplicity's sake we are leaving out of the analysis the very important element of the Jesuit educational commitment to non-Catholics.) In 1961, 66% of the 839,000 Catholic university students were studying in secular universities. At the end of this decade it is anticipated that 1,200,000 Catholics will be members of secular university student bodies, i.e. 75% of the Catholic total. The data suggests that Jesuit universities will be educating a smaller and smaller percentage of Catholic students. It is also quite probable that the Jesuit productivity ratio will rise over the years, diluting our potential impact.

Difficulties arise immediately from trying to interpret Jesuit productivity in terms of a general ratio, even admitting its usefulness. For one thing, it assumes the equal productivity (in terms of Jesuit college objectives) of each Jesuit work on the campus, e.g. the administrator, the fund raiser, the student

counselor, the professor of the social sciences, of the natural sciences and of theology. It is true that each Jesuit worker in these areas is equally a member of the university family, but it would seem reasonable to assign priorities, at least in terms of our own college objectives as enunciated by Father General. To be specific, a Jesuit university treasurer is possibly less essential than a Jesuit university theologian. How many Jesuit administrators could be replaced by capable laymen without a loss (indeed, with a gain) in Jesuit productivity?

To put the question more generally: Where can our limited Jesuit resources be invested most productively? Standards of comparison are lacking, but it is at least conceivable that a small team of Jesuit professionals could work on the campus and in the classroom of a great secular university without sacrifice of Jesuit productivity. This implies of course, a concentration of resources on those students and faculty best equipped to function as apostles in the university milieu.

The Principle of Leverage

Not a few apostolic and dedicated Jesuits refer to what might be identified as the principle of leverage in justifying Jesuit exclusion from the secular university apostolate. This principle implies that a carefully-selected, well-educated, and highly-motivated "few" will surely leaven the "many." This is an excellent principle, thoroughly Ignatian and well exploited by our Communist brethren. The nub of the problem lies in the selection, education, and motivation of the "few." For one thing, it would be hard to prove that the "few" may be found only on the Jesuit university campus. Can we select our "few" without reference to the apostolic potential of the secular university student? Even using the measuring rod of vocations, for instance the number of vocations per priest per year, would we find that Jesuit productivity on the Jesuit campus is so clearly superior to the secular campus?

A Jesuit University Team in Puerto Rico

One alternative to investing Jesuits exclusively in Jesuit universities is now being tried in Puerto Rico. The New York Province has assigned an initial team of five Jesuits (three with doctorates) to work fulltime in connection with the University of Puerto Rico, a state-supported institution. The

UPR was founded sixty years ago and now has a student body of 16,000 on its main Rio Piedras campus and 1,100 faculty. Few universities exercise the intellectual and cultural influence on their country that the UPR does. In 1963, it sent some 3,200 graduates into teaching, legal, medical, and business careers in this tiny island of 2.5 million people.

The Instituto Ignaciano, the formal title of the Jesuit university team, was formed in August, 1962. At present, two priests teach at the University, and three function as student counselors. Individual Jesuits work with a pluralistic structure of UPR student and faculty groups: JOC, Cine-Foro, Bible study, and other Catholic Action groups. Vital contact has also been made with the Protestant denominations working at the UPR to investigate the possibility of establishing a Department of Theology. It is still too early to assess the impact of the Instituto, but there is every indication that it will be successful. Much will depend upon the careful application of the principle of leverage. Jesuit productivity under these circumstances is largely dependent on the development and stimulation of lay apostolic initiative.

What would an ideal Jesuit university team be? It is still too early to make an evaluation. One feasible combination would be to have four to five Jesuits teaching regularly as members of individual Faculties (e.g. social science, education, law, medicine) ; two trained student counselors; one University chaplain directly concerned with Catholic Center religious activities; two to three visitors (not necessarily Jesuits) on rotation from other universities to teach and do research. Such a team would necessarily develop slowly.

Conclusion

We have tried to suggest that Jesuit university participation may be an analogous concept which includes both Jesuit and secular universities. It appears reasonable to conclude that the Jesuit universities have little prospect of keeping pace with the growing Catholic student body. In terms of Jesuit productivity we discovered no solid grounds for assuming that Jesuits in secular universities would be less productive than their brothers in Jesuit universities. Both face the key challenge of the Jesuit educational apostolate which is to apply the Ignatian principle of leverage.

V. JESUITS AS TEACHERS IN SECULAR UNIVERSITIES

PATRICK A. DONOHUE, S.J.

AS I UNDERSTAND THE QUESTION raised by the editors of the Symposium, we are to consider the merit of Ours aiming to teach in secular universities. Broken down the question resolves itself into three considerations: (1) How would it affect the secular institution? (2) Should it be advocated? (3) Would it be a compromise of our own educational system? It should also be kept in mind that we are speaking of a few Jesuits in such an apostolate, less, perhaps, than twenty in the whole country.

The Epitome

If the reason for undertaking such a ministerium is the current and expected superior number of Catholics enrolled in secular schools, I think it can be said, speaking absolutely, that the Epitome of the Institute might be invoked in favor of the program. The basic norm dictating the selection of ministries seems to be that indicated in No. 602, viz.: "Bonum quo universalius, eo est divinius." In the preceding paragraph, however, the words are used: "Tamen in tam ampla vinea Domini certum delectum habet in ministeriis exercendis." The "certus delectus" qualifies the earlier notion that the Society embraces in its zeal all kinds of persons and situations.

It would seem to me, therefore, that the Society in the United States has substantially committed itself to education, secondary, collegiate and post-baccalaureate, and, in so doing, has exercised its "delectus" in an almost total manner. This is not to say that other works are excluded. Thus, we must give of our personnel to foreign missions, retreat houses, mission bands and a dozen other existing activities. Nor is it impossible to take on new ministries from time to time in accordance with need and manpower demands.

Present Commitments

In the light of existing commitments and obligations, therefore, I would be totally opposed to training any of Ours specifi-

cally for an apostolate in a secular institution. I would certainly encourage our more able men to undertake when invited an occasional semester or quarter at a secular school. As a career, however, I doubt the worth of such an important investment. Talent is not so common among members of the Society that we can overlook the needs of our existing institutions. Our first duty is to the students enrolled in our own schools, and it is no secret that even in the cherished fields of philosophy and theology we are unable to present in our 28 schools departments of unquestioned superiority. Until that day dawns I feel it would be substantially unjust to our own students to supply men for a new and questionable ministerium.

Our Primary Need

Somewhere in the preceding paragraphs I think I have answered questions two and three. There remains question one: How would it affect secular institutions? Personally I think the effect is minimal when compared with what one able Jesuit can accomplish on a Catholic campus. The great secular schools are able to bring on their campuses men of note from all over the world. The appearance of a Jesuit lecturer could certainly heighten the esteem of the secular educational world for the Society of Jesus but the effect on the class or lecture-group would hardly have the long-lasting effect his appearance would have made on a Jesuit campus where the entire institution is geared to intellectual accomplishment in a climate of equal concern for moral development. In the second case he would be part of an over-all process while in the first he would merely be a curiosity.

I feel very strongly that Ours should be on fire to make our own institutions fully first class. When that is done, there may be room for more effort in the field of secular education. I do not, however, feel that the appeal to great numbers will be accomplished through the device of the Jesuit teacher at the secular institution. There will always be far too many institutions demanding such aid. If there is a medium for the masses, it seems to me that this medium must be television. Its obvious value is not only its carrying power but its blessed economy in terms of personnel.

In any case, our schools are infinitely stronger than they

were a generation ago. Given our limited manpower I think we would make a great mistake if we were to divert that talent, even in small numbers, to a full-time occupation on a secular campus. The same people who have the talent to qualify for such a secular post will also transform existing institutions into thoroughly excellent institutions.

VI. RELIGION AT WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

JOHN A. HARDON, S.J.

WESTERN MICHIGAN IS A STATE INSTITUTION, with a current enrollment of twelve thousand students, of whom about twenty-three hundred registered as Catholic. The State Board of Education has been the responsible governing body for W.M.U. It established broad general policies and regulations and was authorized to make such changes in policy as seemed necessary. Appointment of a priest to teach Catholic theology was therefore subject to the approval of the State Board, and my tenure at the university began under the jurisdiction of the same governing body.

In January, 1962, the Detroit Provincial, Father McGrail, was approached by a representative of Western Michigan, inquiring into the prospects of having a Jesuit teach on their faculty: "The professor hired would be asked to set up a program of Catholic studies. It is hoped that a four year program might eventually result." Officials at Western were conscious of the pioneering nature of the project:

> The idea of a state-supported university hiring a Catholic theologian is a revolutionary one, and the opportunity offered to advance the cause of the Church and true religion would be enormous. Obviously the man to fill such a position would have to be a scientific theologian who was able to resist the temptation to proselytize, and in no sense would he be under the authority of the Newman Club chaplain or have any pastoral obligation at the Newman Club.
>
> He would be, of course, as free as any other professor to carry on any activities, pastoral or otherwise, which he might wish when he was not at the university. It is essential in the hiring of this professor that he be in no sense presented by the church or any of its agencies as an official candidate for the position.
>
> Dr. Loew (head of the department) wishes simply to hire the best individual he can find, and the fact that he might be a priest or a

> member of a religious order must remain coincidental so that there would be no danger of difficulty on the Church-State question.

As a result of this invitation, I visited the university in April, during which time I had conferences with members of the faculty, the dean, and vice-president of the institution. One problem seemed insurmountable, the dilemma between sectarian teaching (which university officials feared was inevitable for a Catholic theologian), and academic freedom (to which I appealed in my conferences with the administration). One paragraph in the university's official policy on academic freedom was crucial:

> The teacher is entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing his subject, but he should be careful not to introduce into his teaching controversial matter which has no relation to his subject. Limitations of academic freedom because of religious or other aims of the institution should be clearly stated in writing at the time of the appointment.

The dilemma was resolved by the university's offering me a two-year contract without any written statement of limitations of academic freedom. My status would be that of associate professor with starting salary of $8,500 for the school year of approximately eight and a half months.

Courses and Students

After detailed negotiations, I agreed to teach four classes each with three hours' credit as Religion, the Humanities, or electives. There was no discrimination between these and the regular courses in terms of academic value in the curriculum. Enrollment for the classes varied. But in the past two years, the average numer of students per class was fifty.

Although I never made an accurate calculation, I think more than one-half of the students in the classes were not Catholic. The Catholics came from different backgrounds, some with no formal religious education and others with twelve or more years of Catholic training.

The courses I have taught range across the whole spectrum of the department. A course in the Fundamentals of Catholic Theology covers the essentials of Catholic dogma, using Sheed's *Theology and Sanity* as a textbook. An Introduction to Religion examines the development of religious culture from the

primitive to the Egyptians and Babylonians, the Greeks and Romans in the Christian era. Oriental Religions is a survey course of the major Eastern religions, especially Hinduism and Buddhism. Representative Christian Thinkers reviews the principal Christian writers from Augustine to the Reformation period. In Catholic Moral Theology I managed to cover the first principles of Christian ethics and a run-down of the moral virtues, with over six weeks of class on marriage, birth control, and allied topics. For two semesters I have taught the Shaping of Religion in America, with special attention to the three main religious cultures in the United States: Protestantism, Roman Catholicism, and Judaism. The latest is a course in the Interpretation of the New Testament, where we get a purview of the Gospels and the Pauline Epistles.

Illustrative of the caliber of these courses, the textbooks used included: Wikenhauser, *Introduction to the New Testament;* Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity;* Mendelsohn, *Ancient Near Eastern Religions;* Karl Adam, *Spirit of Catholicism;* Hughes, *Popular History of the Catholic Church;* Pegis, *Select Writings of Saint Thomas Aquinas;* along with copious notes of my own. For the course in Moral Theology the students used a textbook in mimeograph that was sold at the university book store.

Student Response

If I were to describe the student response in one word I would call it stimulating, with obvious differences of reaction in the different subject offerings. They ask questions with a freedom that shows an interest in the subject and an inquisitive mind that is looking for answers to some of life's most fundamental problems. I could write a book of these *quaesita* to illustrate the kind of thinking going on among students at state universities.

Catholics are often critical of their early training. "Haven't we been brainwashed into believing what we do? . . . How could we think otherwise than as Catholics if from childhood we were given only one side of the question? . . . Are the Sisters in parochial schools equipped to prepare people for life in the real world, when they have little or no contact with that world? . . . Why were we never told about the population explosion until

we came to a secular university?" More than one student explained privately that the reason he or she decided in favor of a secular college was to get "the other viewpoint" which he felt was absent or evaded in Catholic higher education.

Those who are not Catholic imply and sometimes explicitly say that their main objection to Catholicism is that Catholics cannot think for themselves. They are surprised to find that the Church allows a great deal of freedom on many issues, and that Protestants and others may be more restricted by their tradition than are Catholics by theirs. Evolution is a case in point. When taking the creation of Adam and Eve, they admired the liberty that Catholics enjoy in their attitude towards a possible progressive origin of the human species; they contrasted this with the constraint imposed by some other churches. Several felt that just to be able to say that the world did not come into existence in six days of twenty-four hours each was enough to lay the ghost of a conflict between faith and science.

One dominant impression the students have left on me is their growing conviction that morality is not based on objective standards but varies according to relative circumstances. Catholics and believing Protestants especially seem prone to toy with the idea and tempted to question the whole body of moral principles which Christianity has "imposed" upon them.

Time and again they told me the rudest shock they received on coming to Western was the discovery that so many people do not consider wrong what they had previously been told was sinful. "How do I know it's a sin," the wonder, "if respectable men and women think otherwise?" This opinion is confirmed by the textbooks, teachers, and classroom discussions that create the academic atmosphere of the university.

In order to make sure the students apply themselves, I have periodic quizzes on the matter covered. They are announced a week beforehand and contribute substantially to the final grade. One effect has been that the class notes are brought up to date and the contents summarized in a way that would not otherwise be done if only a final examination were given.

When a student does poorly in the quiz, I offer him the opportunity of repeating orally in my office after a few days, and standing a good chance of raising his grade. Many avail them-

selves of this offer, at the cost of more intensive study and further clarification when we go over the matter privately.

Parallel with the quizzes are the six-week reading reports. Instead of demanding a written summary of what was read or personal reaction to a book I have the students get printed forms from the book store: five by eight cards that are signed and identified as to class, department, and date. All that has to be reported is the title and author of a book, the page from and to which it was read, and the total number of pages for all titles consulted. I told students there are ways of checking on whether and what they have read. The average for all classes is about three titles per six week period, for each student, or a total of about four hundred pages. Some read as high as a dozen entire books in the month and a half; with rare exception from the master list given to each person at the opening of classes in September.

About mid-semester all the classes receive a set of directives for the term paper which counts for a third of their grade. Ten pages are the minimum length, and a carbon copy is to be turned in along with the ribbon copy, the latter returned with comments, and the former retained by the teacher. Many of the suggested topics are consciously evocative: "Why Pray? . . . What Does Religion Mean to Me? . . . The Eucharist is Christ . . . The causes of the Reformation . . . Faith and Science, in Conflict or Cooperation?" Several asked permission to canvass their fellow-students on one of the general topics, like prayer or the meaning of religion in their lives. The reports are then collected and analyzed, and the analysis submitted (along with the reports) as the term paper.

Private conferences with the students have become another staple of my work at the university. Circumstantial needs and the school's official policy combined to encourage my giving whatever time could be spared for counseling. As stated in the university's directives to the faculty, "Ability as a teacher includes proficiency in classroom instruction, initiative and skill in the development and administration of the teaching program. It includes also interest and success in student guidance. The function of the teacher as a guide and counselor extends beyond the classroom into every phase of the life of the student as a member of the college community."

Without betraying any confidences, I can say that the problems range over the whole spectrum of student life. Most of them are occasioned by the conflict set up in the mind between ideals and religious principles inherited from home and previous education, and the basic neutralism of studies and atmosphere at the university. Some are easily soluble, by just a word of direction, the right book to read, or a bit of prudent advice. Others are more complex, and, when they impinge heavily on the moral side, I suggest the student go to the respective chaplains on campus for further direction.

Administration and Faculty

The educational program of a Catholic priest at Western Michigan would be unthinkable without support and encouragement received from the administration and faculty at the university. I have nothing but the highest praise for both, and feel that here especially we have much to learn about the generosity and willingness to cooperate of non-Catholic educators —if only they are rightly approached.

On the several occasions I have dealt with President Miller, I found him easy to confer with and more than willing to support, even promote, first my coming to Western and then consolidating my stay. After the first public announcements reached the newspapers, the university received letters of commendation and protest. Dr. Miller helped to handle the latter and saw to it that the complainants were courteously answered and the university policy defended against charges of mixing Church and State.

Dr. Seibert, vice-president for academic affairs, was frank in exposing the newness of my coming to teach Catholicism at a state institution. He saw the legal implications and allowed me to express my own feelings before signing the contract. Yet, once convinced that this was good for the university and for public education, he has supported the venture wholeheartedly. In a talk he gave on invitation from Nazareth College in the city, he impressed the audience with his deep Christian faith and high idealism.

The head of the department, Dr. Loew, was equally cooperative. My relations with him covered such items as class schedules, enrollment, classroom technique, and a host of small

details that frequently come up in the daily routine of teaching. In all of these the cooperation has been all that I could desire, and, perhaps, more than I expected.

The library personnel have gone out of their way to assist with my ordering of books for the shelves and with giving the students all the service possible to meet the reading requirements in my courses. In the list submitted for the first term, the library ordered upwards of five hundred titles, and assigned a person for a time to specially take care of the huge accessioning problem which this created.

Similarly the university book store has helped beyond the call of duty, stocking textbooks and paperback editions of books to fulfill the required reading assignments.

Among the encouraging features of teaching at Western has been the spirit of friendliness in the department, where the faculty members come together regularly to share their ideas, problems and plans. We meet quite often for informal discussion, say when some prominent person visits the university for a lecture, seminar or conference. On a more formal level, we organized a kind of intercollegiate faculty club, with representatives from the departments of philosophy and religion at Western Michigan, Kalamazoo and Nazareth Colleges. Monthly meetings are held at the homes of participating members, to the number of twenty.

Some Conclusions

Although implied in the foregoing, it may be useful to summarize briefly what I consider the dominant impressions growing on me as I enter the fourth term at a state university.

First is an opening of horizons on the potential for the future. Legal experts, even those most hostile to Federal Aid or any kind of public subsidy of church-affiliated schools, see no unsurmountable obstacle to inclusion of formal courses in religion and theology at state institutions of higher learning. The Western Michigan experiment is, for the present, proving the viability of such a program, with five years' experience for the Protestant teachers on campus and a full three terms with a Catholic priest in the department.

Second is the feeling that we can learn something from secular colleges towards offering students in Catholic institu-

tions a more attractive course of studies. By attractive I do not mean academically glittering, but a greater assurance than we do at present that graduates of Catholic universities are being adequately prepared to meet and live with a mainly secularist or at least non-Catholic environment. Studies indicate that not all Catholics in secular colleges (about seventy per cent in the United States) make this choice for financial reasons. A deeper underlying cause may be they suspect that another four years of Catholic education would unfit them for the give-and-take of public life in America.

Finally, I have become aware of a spiritual hunger among the students which is not being satisfied in the present system of public university education. It takes very little to give them a taste for things of the spirit, and correspondingly little to supply at least some of the needs they feel. To illustrate, I quote from a personal essay given me by one of my students, not Catholic, who wrote on the subject: Why pray? He said, "In my estimation, the believer must pray as an absolute necessity to true happiness and peace of mind in this life and the next, as an absolute necessity to true direction, positiveness, and worthwhileness of life, and as an absolute necessity to inner courage and strength to live in the world without being contaminated by it. Why pray? A better question might be, 'Why *not* pray?' "

These sentiments are not the exception but the rule. Often more crudely expressed, they nevertheless indicate that the teaching apostolate in America has a new and larger task ahead than most Catholic educators suspect.

Note: *This summer the University is sponsoring a full-scale Ecumenical Institute and Conference in the graduate school. It will be the first of its kind in the country, and Fr. Hardon's membership on the faculty was directly responsible for its inauguration. (Ed.)*

VII. THE SOCIETY AND THE TEACHING APOSTOLATE TODAY*

DAVID J. BOWMAN, S.J.

Question 1: Do you think we should undertake the apostolate of the secular campus? And if so, should we go as individuals or groups, to be teachers or to be Newman Club chaplains?

Reply: I don't think it's even a debatable question, whether or not the apostolate of the Society would be more universal were we to get our men on the public campus, as well as in our own schools. When you talk about our *Constitutions* and the *universalissima ratio* of the apostolate—this, I think, is the Jesuit ideal. This is obviously a horrible oversimplification. But, nevertheless, it seems to me we should go in there as teachers if they'll have us. And I suspect that we could find just as many places available as we would have men; more really, but that's only a guess.

With respect to whether we go as individuals or as a group —I think if Father Provincial would send a group, this would be by all means better. But here better means "to some extent": Are we going to go soon? If the group would not go until 1983, whereas the individual might go in '67, then I'd say it's better to go as an individual. At Iowa I went as an individual when the Provincial assigned me.

However, if you had a cluster of Jesuits running a Catholic Institute on a public campus, it seems to me this would be money in the heavenly bank. You couldn't beat it as an apostolic opportunity in our country. That's a prejudiced judgment, dear brothers, but I'm a prejudiced man on this by my experiences.

If we could run Catholic Institutes on the public university campus, this would be the best thing for us to do. If others would take care of the Newman apostolate, and would do a good job of it, we should leave it to them. I would guess that our work now, the possible work, would be as lecturers; that is the specific work that we as Jesuits, due to our training and vocation, could do best. And I hope this doesn't sound smug, but our other fellow priests in other religious orders, as a rule, are not trained for this apostolate, so that they could expect good

(*Based on a tape-recorded interview.)

success; whereas we are. Whether we believe it or not we do get a liberal education in the Society, no matter what we think of the juniorate, philosophate, and even the theologate. By the time we finish tertianship, if we've got brains in our head, they're open. And they're open to the world in which we live. And our regency does something for us which at least you find difficult to discern in priests of other orders. They get that too late, I think, that contact and sympathy and that necessity of trying to understand young people.

Question 2: What about a Roman collar walking in to teach another subject, as for example the history of the Reformation period? Or philosophy—a most critical area, perhaps? To what extent would they be open to that?

Reply: Wide open! This would be my judgment on it. No problem whatsoever. You see, they've got all kinds of weird-looking people around universities. You've got a Buddhist in a saffron robe, and so forth. The Roman collar, to some extent, is an academic garb.

It seems to me in my interfaith work, of which I do as much as I can, the two great things which have happened to the Church within the last ten years are Pope John and John Kennedy. And it's hard to say which has done more for the Church in this country. I'm serious about that. John Kennedy, in that speech to the Houston Baptist ministers above all, I think, will go down as a milestone in the history of the Church in America. So we've got doors open now that were never open before.

So, I think anybody that Father Provincial would release could do good work. However I think what many places would most like now—their desperate need—is men in theology and philosophy. That is what many public universities feel they need from us right now. As far as the opportunity would go I would guess that theology would be used most, and especially now with the Council and Ecumenism.

Question 3: What do you think our influence on the faculty of a secular institution would be? Would it still be confined to dissipating bias for the most part?

Reply: Well, all I can say is what I found at Iowa, of course. There's bias against religion in general almost built in, in the

sociology, anthropology, and philosophy departments in all likelihood. Some of these people will have long since put religion out of their lives and taken another ultimate value in its place. Many have been exposed to very sad religious experiences in the various religions which have only the "gittar and singin' " and things like that. And naturally these people, as long as they retain this idea, will write off any idea like a School of Religion. But at Iowa after the men were there for a while, they were accepted and there was no question about the academic standing of religion. But this took thirty years. And there was much objection until they had got into touch with the academic community, and established themselves. There was still much deriding of religion in the fields of sociology, anthropology, and philosophy. Gustave Bergman, a pragmatist, was there. He is a Viennese Jew who knew a great deal about the Church. And he used to love to take cracks at it. But college students can take that; and as long as they've got a background, I don't think there's a danger to their faith—if they're adult believing people; sometimes that's the "joker."

In general, though, I would say this: We couldn't expect to set the tone of a large university, of course; but we could very well affect the tone of hundreds of lives within that university —hundreds, not just a few.

Question 4: What effect do you think such an apostolate would have on our own schools and their future? Or should we re-think the role of our schools in the Church?

Reply: Well, that is *the* problem, isn't it? In a sense our own schools are the weakness of our strength. They are the greatest apostolate of the Jesuits in America. I think we all can presume that. But at least it's an open question whether or not we are immobilized by this. Are we dug in behind walls and we can't move out anymore? And is this the *militia Christi?* From tertianship you get filled with this—the availability of Jesuits for the work of the Church. A man of God in the service of the Church. And if the Church wanted us on the public campuses, you'd hope we'd be willing, ready, and eager. But when you've got Provincials and Deans who are desperate to get teachers into the classrooms; when you've got ten thousand students who all take theology, what do you do? Well, my suggestion was—you don't have ten thousand stu-

dents; you get rid of five thousand of them as soon as you can. And let someone else do with them what they can; at least as far as your school goes.

We belong, it seems, not to our school system but to the Church. And if our superiors, in conjunction with the bishops, would see that the apostolate of the Church includes the public universities as well as ours, wouldn't it follow that they would want our men out there? And that we would make whatever adaptations we would need to make in our own university system?

Question 5: As we reconsider here the role of our own schools in the Church, what do you think about a plan of cooperation among our own universities, or with other universities?

Reply: We possibly could affiliate with public universities. In Cleveland they started a small liberal arts college—Cleveland College—with the cooperation of Western Reserve University, Case, Fenn, and John Carroll University. All those presidents were called in on it, and apparently there was no problem about it. This isn't affiliation, but at least it's cooperation or some sign of it. The frightening thing is that there doesn't seem to be any urgency about cooperating in the educational field in general, even among our Catholic schools, much less with the public universities. But isn't it true that we are ordained for the Church, and not for an individual province only, or even for the Society alone—but for the Church—for Christ?

Part of the problem, again as I see it, is that we're wedded to one house. Now in Europe they're not. Whatever the reason is, I don't know it. Many of the professors in Europe will teach a semester in Paris and a semester in Rome, and they consider it an honor; it's a sign of prestige to teach in two places. But over here it's a rare man that does so. I don't know how many do it. Well, why can't we, even within the province, switch the faculty around? Of course there will be some administrative problems. You'd have to have a department head who'd be permanent. But there just doesn't seem to be much "give" anymore. We seem to have to have a permanent position *in saecula saeculorum.*

Question 6: By way of a little self-reflection on our part and a guess on yours, what effect do you think this symposium will have?

Reply: I don't know; but I don't think this is going to have a discernible influence on superiors right now. But what we can do now is get these things into the open forum; that's necessary. And that will be the wonderful thing about this symposium. And once the ideas are out there, the second time round, as you know from your years in the Society, the ideas don't sound so half-witted. And then the third time around, somebody will be there who was involved in it originally; and he will sponsor it. He'll be a superior or a prefect of studies by that time. And again they'll be used to the ideas then. Archbishop Roberts in his little book, *Black Popes,* has something to the effect that anybody who is going to do something for the first time had better be ready for trouble. And that's right! So, first time, trouble; but second time, not so much.

In this connection I might remark that we all think we're serving Christ in an important way. If we will just communicate this to each other; that seems to be the shibboleth. But the curse is when we don't talk to one another about these things. One just presumes what the other thinks. And you never ask him; and you never try to tell him what you think. But you just sulk in your tent about it and nothing gets done.

Finally, I would just like to say that there are, quite obviously, very many complications to this thing. I hope that you won't think that I believe the solution is simple. I think I have at least that much sense to know this problem is very complex. But it seems to me that the simple things I have to tell you are at least part of the complexity of it.

CONCLUSION

We wish to thank the contributors most sincerely for their generous and stimulating replies. Now that the problem has been clarified and several suggestions toward a solution have been made, the essential purpose of this Symposium has been accomplished. Clearly, the problem is not simply an intramural one for the Society; the future of the Church in America is involved. As men of the Church, Jesuits will be called upon to give a generous and appropriate response.

Research As A Prelude To Aggiornamento

A proposal for the creation in America of an Institute for Ecclesiastical Research

R. J. Pendergast, S.J.

THE PRESENT VATICAN COUNCIL has proclaimed to the world that the most pressing need of the Church at this moment in her history is *aggiornamento,* adaptation of her structure, proceedures and outlook to the needs and problems of the time. The response to this proclamation has been nothing less than startling. Evidently Pope John was guided by the Holy Spirit to initiate a movement that answered to a deeply felt need in the hearts of Christians, non-Catholics as well as Catholics. We Jesuits, who are dedicated to serving the Church in her most urgent needs, have experienced the desire to advance the cause of *aggiornamento* at least as intensely as others. There seems to be a widespread feeling among us that we should make some contribution to this movement. In this paper I wish to suggest that one of the most effective ways in which we could do so would be by undertaking a systematic study of the Church and her problems in an effort to find solutions to those problems and to propagate them to the rest of the Church.

Intelligent action is impossible without previous thought. In past ages of history the thought of mankind developed very slowly and consequently men's ways of doing things changed very slowly also. Under these conditions action could be based, to a great extent, upon "common sense," an inherited set of principles, presuppositions, methods, which had been worked out slowly and tested by pervious generations. In our own

time, however, the movement of thought has accelerated immeasurably and as a result the rate of change in mankind's ways of doing things has increased proportionately. Today, common sense is no longer a sufficient basis for action.

The factor largely responsible for the increased speed of the movement of human thought, and consequently for the increased rate of change of human society and its institutions, is research. At the base of today's vast research programs lies the conviction that systematic and prolonged effort to understand any given phenomenon is bound to result ultimately in a great deal of new knowledge, knowledge frequently so extensive and important as to change our outlook, and consequently our actions, radically. Because of this conviction, ingrained by several centuries of startlingly successful verification, modern man has institutionalized the systematic effort to understand in a vast complex of universities, research institutes, learned societies and publications.

However, this insight of the modern secular mind does not seem to have been integrated fully into the thinking of the Church. The Church was one of the initiators of scholarly activity in the Western World, and certainly the research of modern Catholic scholars into the liturgy, scripture, and various fields of theology are significant and successful research efforts. But if one compares the percentage of her resources which the Church has put into these efforts with the percentage of its resources which secular American society puts into research, the discrepancy seems great. Many types of research which would be very useful are being neglected almost completely, and even in fields where Catholic scholars are active the effort is less than is desirable.

It should be noted that a few isolated workers in a given field are not sufficient. What is needed is an institutionalized research effort. It is the institutionalization of research which is responsible for its impact upon the modern world. In order to make really important advances it is necessary to have a fairly large number of workers who stimulate and complete one another's thought. High standards of professional competence are needed, as well as various kinds of facilities and semiprofessional assistance. Finally, the effort must be continued over a long period of time with high intensity since it

seems that any given generation is capable of creating and exploiting only one really new point of view.

All these requirements can be met only by self-perpetuating institutions. A brilliant individual can make a beginning but unless this beginning is pushed forward by an institution it will not bear the fruit is should.

I would suggest then that one of the greatest contributions which the American Society of Jesus can make today to the welfare of the Church is the creation of an Institute for Ecclesiastical Research which would be a center for intensive investigation of all areas of Church life.[1]

What would be some of the kinds of work carried on at the Institute? Of prime importance would be first class research in Theology, Scripture and Church History. There is need, in the United States at least, of a greatly increased effort in these traditional disciplines whose importance for the health of the church is so great. There is no reason why Americans cannot lead the world in these fields as we do in the physical sciences. Certainly the vast discrepancy between American Catholic and European theological scholarship is a sign that something is wrong with our present policies.

---

1. Since the first draft of this paper was written in September, 1963, two developments have come to my attention which may mark the beginning of the actual implementation of the ideas proposed here. The first is the decision that in the future the Institute of Social Order will make research its main function. If the work of the transformed Institute is adequately supported by the assistancy it may develop in time along the lines indicated in this paper. The second development is the completion in August, 1963, of a study by a commission established and financed by the major superiors of the mission sending societies that are members of the Mission Secretariat of the N.C.W.C. This study recommends the establishment of "a center for coordinated research and cooperation in the universal apostolate." The viewpoint of the ten members of the commission (none of whom are Jesuits) seems quite similar to the one expressed in this paper, except that what they envision is a cooperative effort involving all religious orders and, ultimately, the hierarchy and the entire American Church. Some initial steps toward the implementation of this recommendation have already been taken. If this project develops as the study commission hopes, it would seem that the Society's research efforts should be integrated into it. However, since the project is still somewhat problematic I have not felt it necessary to rewrite the body of this paper in order to take account of it, in spite of its possibly great future importance.

But though there may be need for more and better research in the ecclesiastical sciences, especially here in America, quite a bit is already being done in these fields. There are other areas where effort is almost non-existent.

Potential Areas of Research

There is great need for long-range basic research into the area of intersection between religion and the sciences, particularly the social sciences. Unless we understand human psychology and culture as adequately as possible we cannot present the message of the Gospel in a way that does justice to it. Furthermore, we even risk misunderstanding it ourselves. Thus many students of missiology think that much of the missionary effort of the past several centuries was wasted because neither the missionaries nor their hearers were able to distinguish between the word of God and the western culture with which it had become entagled. And how many of the disasters which have befallen the church in past centuries were ultimately due to her inability to understand the true nature of developing social and scientific movements?

If there is anything we can be sure of, it is this. The world is destined to change more rapidly and radically in the future than it has in the past. If we are to come to terms with these changes and even to direct them along a path that will be beneficial to mankind, the thinking of Church leaders must be informed by an acute appreciation of and quick response to the real nature of what is happening. But the complexity of the issues involved is such that only an organized research effort will make it possible to comprehend what is going on.

I will now list some areas of possible research which seem important to me. This list is certainly not complete and may not even include the areas which are really the most vital.

First of all, we need a lot of sheer information. We need to know more than we do about the real attitudes of our Catholic people, and of non-Catholics also, toward religious values, about the influence their faith has in their lives, about the pressures of the environment which are inimical to their Christian ideals, about the success of our present apostolates in helping them, about the possible benefits of new ministries and new approaches.

A specific example of a useful study would be a thorough follow-up of the research of J. T. Fox on the attitudes of college students towards their Church.[2] Fox concludes that "Catholic College students, on the whole, have achieved and maintained a more favorable attitude toward their Church than do Protestant students. Yet, this and other research suggests this difference is not related to present or past school attendance. The conditions, both social and psychological, which may contribute to this phenomena should be extensively studied and analyzed by social researchers and religious educators."

The relevance of such studies to our choice ministries is obvious.

Another area in which we need more understanding is that of religious and priestly vocations. What are the psychological and social factors which influence them, what are the dynamics of the process of disintegration and failure in the lives of some of those who are called, and of growth and sanctification in others?

The Church and Religious Orders

Another very important field of research for the Institute would be the study of religious orders and of the Church itself as human organizations. Today students of organizations are very much interested in the questions of creative involvement, communication, and adaptation of organizational structure. Creative involvement: What are the conditions under which the individual member of an organization will be most creative and productive, most involved in and satisfied by the achievement of the purposes of the organization? Communication: What is the importance of, and what are the conditions for effective communication of ideals and goals from the organization to the individual member and of needs and ideas from the individual member to the organization? Adaptation: How does an organization determine what objectives it should pursue and how does it create the structures best adapted to achieving those objectives? How are these structures revised so as to keep pace with changing problems?

2. J. T. Fox, "The Attitude of Male College Students Toward Their Church," *The American Catholic Sociological Review*, XXIV (Summer 1963), pp. 127-131.

To me, it seems clear that all these questions apply to religious orders and to the Church as well as to other organizations.

An interesting example of the fruitfulness of this type of thinking is the "cursillo" movement. This movement is the result of a sustained effort by a small group of men to find an effective way to transmit the ideals of the Church to individuals.[3] I do not know whether the originators of the movement were conversant with the principles of "group dynamics" when they began their work, but I believe that it is obvious that if they were not, they discovered and applied them for themselves.

One of the more important parts of the study of the Church as a human organization would be what we might call ecclesiastical political science, the study of power and authority in the Church. Besides an increased theological effort to understand the divinely given element in ecclesiastical authority we need to understanding its human component a lot better. Just how is authority really exercised, what are the psychological and social factors which shape our view of it and our response to it, how efficient and above all, how Christian, are the proceedures and organs through which it is exercised, how could these procedures and organs be improved, as all things human surely can be.

There are a host of other subjects for research which could be mentioned. Some of them are: the problems and possibilities of the modern media of mass communication, Catholic education and especially clerical education, the principles and techniques of the teaching of Christian doctrine. But rather than discuss these topics it seems better to turn instead to the question of the propagation of the results of research to the Church as a whole. The task of making results known can justly be considered a part of the research effort. Under present conditions in the Church it is especially important, for the concept of research does not have firm roots in the Catholic mentality as yet.

There are three means which I would suggest. The first and most obvious is publication. The Institute should publish one

3. Cf. J. McLaughlin, "I Made a Cursillo," *America*, vol. 110, no. 3 (Jan. 18, 1964), p. 94.

or more suitable journals. The second is by training students. This again is obvious. My only remark here is a caution. The Institute should be mainly interested in research. Therefore it should never burden itself with the training of ordinary students. But the training of a limited number of excellent graduate and post-doctoral students would serve several beneficial purposes. The students would help with the research itself, some of them would become future members of the Institute staff, and others would carry a research-oriented attitude into seminaries and influential positions elsewhere. This last point touches upon the third means I would suggest for propagating the results of research.

The Propagation of Research Results

It seems very likely that the present Vatican Council is going to mark the beginning of a fundamental change in the relationship between bishops and the Holy See. Heretofore the only bishop with more than local jurisdiction was the Pope himself. But if the ecumenical council creates national councils of bishops with real and permanent power then there will be another center of authority which shares in some measure the universality of the Pope's power. Hence, the Society will have to assume a relationship to such a council which resembles in some measure the relationship we have had with the Pope alone in the past. Such a change will undoubtedly present some difficulties in the beginning, but besides being necessary I believe that it could be beneficial because it would force upon us more inter-province cooperation and more concern for non-local apostolates. In any event the change will certainly be necessary for it is impossible to imagine the American Society preserving the same indepedence of a national council of bishops that it has had from individual bishops.[4]

Since the close of the first session of the Council it has been remarked frequently by bishops and others that one of the

4. It should hardly be necessary to point out that I am not advocating any retreat from our tradition of service to the Papacy. The Society is an international organization which is at the service of the Church as a whole, and especially of its head. However, it seems clear that the conditions of the modern world make decentralization necessary, as the last two Popes themselves have believed. Consequently, we must adapt ourselves in accord with this new orientation of the Church itself.

chief benefits of the Council was the opportunity it offered the bishops to exchange views with one another and to discuss various questions with experts. Should not this opportunity be made a permanent one?

It seems that it should and that the institute for Ecclesiastical Research would be an ideal setting for such meetings. The Institute could invite bishops to come there for varying periods of time to discuss their problems with one another and to bring themselves up to date on the latest developments in research.

It is conceivable that eventually the hierarchy might ask the Institute to take a role in the training of men whom they are considering for advancement to the episcopacy. In the Armed Forces men who are destined for high command frequently take advanced training at the War College and it is possible that an analogous period of study might be helpful for bishops.[5]

Obviously, any services the Institute might render to the national hierarchy presuppose a desire for them on the part of the hierarchy. However, if we were truly animated by a desire to be of service just as we have been in the past to the Pope, I believe that our efforts would be gladly accepted. I might add that unless we are animated by such a desire we could find ourselves shunted aside. If national councils of bishops are created some radical adjustments may well be required of all religious orders and especially of the Society.

What has been said about a program designed to help bishops applies *mutatis mutandis* to one for religious superiors also. Major superiors of religious orders could be invited to the Institute along with bishops, and some young men and women who seem to possess the qualities necessary for higher office could begin preparation for possible superiorship there.

The vast number of pastors of parishes and local religious superiors make it impossible for the Institute to attempt to handle them all. However, they also need the stimulation and enrichment of viewpoint which could result from contact with their peers and with experts in seminars and summer institutes. Some programs aimed at this are already in existence and the Institute for Ecclesiastical Research could attempt to

5. At this stage the Institute would have ceased to be an affair of the Society alone, if indeed it should ever be such. See footnote 1.

improve them by running model seminars for Jesuit superiors and furnishing information and guidance to other institutions engaged in the work.

Conclusion

The early Jesuits succeeded in exerting an influence upon their time that was all out of proportion to their numbers. The reason for this seems to be that Ignatius correctly diagnosed the needs of the sixteenth century and then concentrated his efforts and those of his followers upon filling those needs. They did what was needed most at the moment.

I believe that one of the vital needs of the Church in our times is the application to her problems of systematic research which makes use of the best modern techniques. By filling this need we can do far more good than we can by the utmost effort in less vital areas. A microgram of a hormone has far more effect on the body than a pound of meat. The reason for this is that the hormone mobilizes energies that already exist. There is a vast amount of energy and good will in the Church today which needs to be directed in the most intelligent way possible; and this means research.

But though eminently worthwhile, a program of research would not be easy to carry through. Not every man can be a competent research worker and even fewer can lead research. In order to get results many of our most intellectually talented men would have to be devoted to this work. This means that a choice would have to be made between this new apostolate and other possible or already existing ones such as education. Choice is often difficult, but surely it is a difficulty which Ignatius intended the Society to face.

I believe that a program like the one envisioned could be begun on a small scale by a single province, but ultimately the resources of the entire American Assistancy would be needed to mount an effort of the magnitude that is desirable. As Fr. Harvanek observes apropos of the creation of an outstanding Catholic University, there is ultimately no substitute for assistancy-wide planning.[6]

---

6. R. Harvanek, "Comment on 'The Role of the Jesuit University,'" *JEQ* XXV (March 1963), p. 226.

The Modern World and Jesuit Relevance

Is Jesuit education geared to the objective of developing socially-conscious graduates?

Louis J. Twomey, S.J.

ON OCTOBER 10, 1949, the *De Apostolatu Sociali* of Very Reverend Father General was published. Within the intervening years, this great social document has only begun to gain the recognition it deserves among Ours. The *De Apostolatu Sociali* is not just a routine communication from the General but a brilliant analysis of why and how Jesuits should equip themselves to meet the fearful challenge of a world in the midst of its worst recorded crisis.

> "The present situation is serious," says Father General. "Danger threatens all Christians, as the enemies of God and man, the materialistic atheists, who have already subjected by force a great portion of the world, put forth all their efforts to extend their sway farther. And there is some foundation for their hope that, with the wide diffusion of their doctrines, the whole world will shortly be under their rule. The inequitable condition, both temporal and spiritual, of by far the greater part of the human race provides a most fertile field for subversive doctrine."

These grim words are the General's way of describing today's world. Equally grim is the fateful dilemma he proposes: ". . . we shall seek in vain to win our fight against Communism unless 'a proper social order is established according to those principles which our more recent Pontiffs have so brilliantly expounded.'"

Conceivably, and the General seems to wish it so, *De Apostolatu Sociali* could become, if adequately implemented, the grand strategy whereby the Society of the 20th century would be equally significant with that of the 16th in guarding and propagating the Kingdom of Christ.

In pleading with the Society of the 20th century to be prepared for the great battles of today and tomorrow, the General gets down to earth. He tells Ours that we must take on a "social-mindedness" by learning for ourselves the socio-economic doctrine of the Church. We must develop a sympathy for, an interest in and a determination to right the grievous wrongs, "consequent to the disregard of social justice and charity," which have made life "for millions of men . . . like a cruel purgatory not to say hell itself."

Educational Objective

In our schools, the General insists, we must train our students to abandon "any spirit of special, privileged class," and teach them "to hunger and thirst after justice, the justice which sees to it that all men receive the due reward of their labors, and that there be a more just distribution of temporal goods, as well as a fuller and more universal sharing of spiritual goods."

How is all this to be achieved? The General outlines for us the pattern we are to follow:

> "It is not desirable, either in our colleges or in our scholasticates, to increase the number of lecture periods. The young men will acquire an elementary knowledge of the encyclicals from their religion classes; but over and above this it is of especial importance that the teacher himself, eager with the charity of Christ, should use every opportunity to fill the hearts of his students with love for the masses. Lectures on the ancient writers, on history, on the native literature of each country, will offer many an occasion by a passing reference for forming these attitudes. For in literature and history we are constantly confronted with the conflict between the selfishness of the kings and nobles and the misery of the people, by whose labor the former indulge in great pomp, wage wars, and win glory for themselves. In this way let the young men learn to hate social evils, which far outweigh those which afflict mere individuals; let them learn, too, to love the virtues which have a wider scope and tend to the common good; and let them practice these at once within the modest limits of their own family, school and friends, with the desire to cultivate them on a broader and fuller scale later on."

There can be little doubt that were the techniques sketched in the preceding paragraphs integrated into Jesuit pedagogy, our high schools, colleges and universities would become the great training grounds for the Christian leaders of the future,

who would reconstruct the social order according to the principles of Christ.

In describing the objectives we hold out to ourselves in this article, we can do no better than to recall a statement of Father John Delaney, S.J. What the statement has to say obviously is even more urgent now than when first written almost twenty-five years ago.

> "The one consistent policy of Nazism, Fascism and Communism has been indoctrination in the schools. The fundamentals of these *isms* are hammered into children's minds with and in grammar and algebra and literature and current events and art. Every subject in the curriculum is the vehicle of propaganda.
>
> "Similarly, every subject in the curricula of our schools can and should be used to inculcate basic Catholic social principles and attitudes.
>
> "The Apostolate of the Church today is the social apostolate. The strongest emphasis in the present development of Catholic doctrine and Catholic practice is social. Under the guidance of the Pope, Catholic teachers from the Vatican to the kindergarten are stressing the Mystical Body, the Mass, Christ, the essential unity of the human race, the social aspect of property, the social nature of the human being.
>
> "Catholicism cannot be taught completely unless the social doctrine of the Church becomes as familiar to our students as the obligation of attending Mass on Sunday. Social-mindedness must become second nature to all Catholics.
>
> "To achieve this it is good, but not good enough, to add to the curriculum classes in sociology, the encyclicals, etc. Social doctrine, social attitudes, social habits of thinking must be presented as an *integral part* of Catholic faith, not as something casually added on that the students may take or leave at will.
>
> "*Thinking with the Church today means thinking socially.* Teaching our students to think socially is not the work of a few specialists. It is the work and duty of every Catholic teacher. . . . Any teacher aware of social problems and interested in solid solutions will be able to find endless opportunities for social indoctrination in class and out of class.
>
> . . ."Every subject in our curriculum can be made a vehicle for the teaching of this complete Catholicism.
>
> "Our students, if they are to be useful citizens and good Catholics, must be made aware of big social problems.
>
> "They must be brought imperceptibly *to think Catholic* on social problems.
>
> "They must be filled with an enthusiasm and determination to

play their part in the reconstruction of the social order along the lines of the social plan of the Pope. . . . We must be ready to face all this and to do something practical about it" (September 1941, issue of *Service Bulletin*, later *Social Order*, formerly published by Institute of Social Order, 3908 Westminister Place, St. Louis, Missouri).

A Critical Appraisal of Jesuit Education

If we accept the validity of Father Delaney's thesis, a crucial question would seem in order. "Is Jesuit education in general geared to the objective of developing socially-conscious graduates?" In searching for the right answer we Jesuits must be honest with ourselves, and not be diverted from our purpose by a mistaken sense of loyalty. The right answer will not be forthcoming unless we are willing to face some distasteful facts. But whatever the cost in terms of shaking our complacency and of upsetting our preconceptions it will be cheap. For in the right answer to that question lie at least the beginnings of the solution to a problem which is now worrying very many of Ours.

Interpreting the Ratio Studiorum

For the Jesuit teacher, especially the young teacher, to assume that the pedagogy now in vogue in our educational system is the final word in classroom efficiency is to stultify constructive criticism and to impair the vitality and adaptability of the *Ratio Studiorum* as evidently conceived by its framers.

It seems to this writer that the techniques suggested in the *Ratio* were never intended to be an iron-clad set of rules admitting of no variability according to the changing needs of changing times. Apart from the principles enunciated—these of course never change—we believe that the *Ratio* was meant to be a dynamic instrument fully capable of being adapted to meet the demands of *current* situations without impairing its substantive content.

Rigid adherence, then, to the letter of the *Ratio*, we submit, is to do violence to its spirit, and severely to handicap the Jesuit teacher in preparing his students to fit adequately into the vastly-disturbed world of the third quarter of the 20th century. This statement suggests another question: Are we

doing in 1964 the kind of a job we think we are doing? In striving to answer this question, we are quite aware of the delicate ground we must tread. But we feel that the treading is an essential part of the process of finding a satisfying answer to our main question.

A Case Study

"I found myself utterly unprepared to meet the realistic world into which I graduated"—thus a brilliant graduate of 1934 from a Jesuit college. In 1934 economic conditions in the United States as well as in the rest of the world were dragging the bottom. Unemployment up to an estimated 15,000,000, multiple-block-long bread lines, acute housing shortages, racial tension, industrial strife, frustrated adults, bewildered youth—these were some of the more dismal characteristics of "the realistic world into which I graduated." A world, except for the number of unemployed, the length of bread lines and the threat of thermonuclear warfare, not greatly different from the topsyturvy world of our day.

The graduate under consideration did not complain about the training he had received in English, Latin, Greek, History and in the other traditional subjects. He was well satisfied with this as well as with the high academic standing of his Alma Mater. But he contends that he might as well have taken his college courses on another planet for all the connection they had with a realistic world sorely beset with a multitude of grave social disorders. He claims he had little knowledge of what these social problems were and less of how to apply Catholic principles to solve them. Although he had spent four years in a Jesuit college, he hardly knew the *Rerum Novarum* and the *Quardragesimo Anno* even by name. He even admits to a period of flirtation with Communism, intrigued as he was with the notion that the Communists at least seemed to have some plan and immense enthusiasm for solving social problems, whereas other groups, including Catholics, were floundering around waiting for the Government to come up with magic formulae. Fortunately, it did not take him long to unmask the deceptive plausibility of the Communist program—certain other Jesuit graduates have not been so fortunate.

The story of this particular graduate had a happier future than past. For once he got over his brush with Marxism, he took out on his own to study the great encyclicals and other authoritative pronouncements on Christian social principles and practices. Today he is a zealous and influential Catholic social actionist; but for this he gives little thanks to his Jesuit training.

Does the picture drawn from a real-life experience of one Jesuit college graduate reflect an unusual situation, or is it typical of most Jesuit graduates? Inasmuch as the graduate in question was, in his confusion, tempted by Communism, the situation is beyond doubt most unusual. But the failure to be informed as to the social doctrine of the Church and its applicability to the very real problems of 1934 as well as of 1964 is typical of a majority of the thousands of Jesuit high school and college graduates that we have known and heard about.

In speaking of a lack of social consciousness among our graduates as well as among Jesuits themselves, Father General says bluntly: "The outcome of our courses and the attitude of those who followed them are ample proof of this fact" (*De Apostolatu Sociali,* #11). On another occasion, the General was even blunter in his criticism of the social deficiency of Jesuit education. "Experience is bearing witness to the fact that not merely in many but in a majority of institutions conducted by the Society the students and the alumni are still a long distance away from a frame of mind (social-consciousness) which squares with the Gospels and is sought for by the Church in her sons. . . . Unless our (social) doctrine is implemented in this way . . . the poor . . . will reiterate what they are now saying everywhere over and over again: 'You preach a very fine-sounding doctrine, but only the socialists and the communists have done something to improve our condition.' "

Again in his letter of November 17, 1954, on St. Joseph Pignatelli, the General returns to the same theme: "As I urged in the Instructio (*De Apostolatu Sociali*) . . ., so now with still greater emphasis and earnestness I beg that we open our eyes to the wretched condition of so many men. How many countries are there, otherwise quite—even highly—civilized, where many or most of the inhabitants lead a life unworthy of a

human being and a son of God. . . . A remedy can be found. We can work to help apply the remedy. . . . Will we depart this life guiltless in God's sight if we fold our arms and leave the job for others to do?"

Some Pertinent Question and Probable Answers

Why is it that sometimes those whom Jesuits have trained are indifferent and even antagonistic to the social teaching of the Church when it goes counter to the social and economic theory and practice of the secularized society in which they live and work? Why is it that those so trained are frequently found among the more reactionary elements in a given community? Why is it that Jesuit products not rarely are far less sensitive to social injustices than many non-Catholics, who lack the guiding norms of the true Faith?

The answers seem clear. For it is difficult to say that they do not add up to a negative reply to the question we posed in the first place, namely, Jesuit education is *not* sufficiently geared to the objective of developing socially-conscious graduates.

In all we are saying there is no intention to disparage the magnificient work that has been done and is being done in the high schools, colleges and universities throughout the American Assistency. No amount even of constructive criticism can dim the glory which Jesuit educational effort in America has richly merited. But we cannot rest satisfied with what we have accomplished. Our contention is, therefore, that in admitting our serious deficiency in one vitally important phase of educating youth for full-rounded Christian living in today's world, we not only do not discount the great achievements of the past, but rather we prepare ourselves for even greater achievements in the future.

In other words, we sincerely believe that Jesuit education has gone far, very far indeed, in getting men and women ready to evaluate the things of time in the perspective of eternity and to live accordingly. But it has not gone far enough. And until we are more willing to recognize social formation as a functional and indispensable part of the educational process, we will continue to turn out graduates who, although they may be exemplary individuals and family members, will never

come to know the true richness of Catholicism as it applies not only to personal and family living, but to the right ordering of political, economic and social life as well.

Unanswered Call for Catholic Action

Under our present handicap of failing to socially indoctrinate our students we cannot hope that later on our graduates will be able to make any significant contribution to the Christian reconstruction of society, which every Pope, especially from Leo XIII down to and including Paul VI, has said is a dire necessity. Too many Jesuit graduates have not been conspicuous in their willingness to give of their time and effort in answering what St. Pius X said is the great need of our time: "Action!" Action in that great apostolate "to which Catholic Action should be specially devoted, namely, the practical *solution of the social question according to Christian principles.*" And the sainted Pontiff tells us exactly what he means by the solution of the social question:

> "To reinstate Jesus Christ in the family, the school and society; to re-establish the principle that human authority represents that of God; to take intimately to heart the interest of the people, especially those of the working and agricultural classes, not only by the inculcation of religion . . . but also by striving . . . to soothe their sufferings, and by wise measures to improve their economic condition; to endeavor, consequently, to make public laws conformable to justice, to amend or suppress those which are not so. . . . All these works, of which Catholic laymen are the principal supporters and promoters . . . constitute what is generally known as a distinctive and surely a very noble name: Catholic Action" (cited from *A Symposium on the Life and Work of Pope Pius X*, pub. by Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, N.C.W.C., Washington, 1946, pp. 126 & 127).

Our alumni are for the most part ill-equipped to fill the role of Catholic laymen as thus outlined by Pius X. And still worse there are not a few who are even ill-disposed to recognize the competency of the Church to interpose its authority except in matters strictly dogmatic. Thus they subject themselves to the stinging rebuke of Pius XII when in addressing the world Congress of the Lay Apostolate, October 14, 1951, he congratulated the delegates on their "resistance to that noxious tendency which exists even among Catholics and which would like to confine the Church to those questions said to be 'purely religious'—not that pains are taken to know exactly what is

meant by that phrase. Provided the Church keeps to the sanctuary and the sacristy, and slothfully lets humanity struggle outdoors in its distress and needs, no more is asked of her." (cf. *Catholic Mind,* February, 1952, p. 120).

But in all fairness it can be asked: who are more to blame for this tragic lack of social consciousness on the part of many of our alumni, they or we, their Jesuit teachers? We can hardly expect them to be alert to the social principles and practices of the Church, if in their formative years these were an unknown world to them. Thus it is no mere idle speculation, but profitable soul-searching to inquire why Jesuit educational effort has been so sluggish in its response to such continued injunctions of the Popes as these:

> "It is our wish that in the education of Christian youth *these things* (namely, econmic and social principles of the Church) *be particularly attended to* . . . lest amid the turmoil of social order and general confusion of ideas they may be as the Apostle says, 'carried about by every wind of doctrine devised in the wickedness of men, in craftiness, according to the wiles of error'" Eph. 4/14 (*Ubi Arcano, Social Wellsprings,* Vol. II, #57).

and:

> "To give to this social activity a greater efficacy, it is necessary to promote a wider study of social problems in the light of the doctrine of the Church and under the aegis of her constituted authority. If the manner of acting of some Catholics in the social-economic field has left much to be desired, this has often come about because they have not known and pondered sufficiently the teaching of the Sovereign Pontiffs on these questions. Therefore, *it is of the utmost importance to foster in all classes of society an intensive program of social education* adapted to the varying degrees of intellectual culture . . . For there are some who, while extremely faithful to practice of their religion, yet in the field of labor and industry, in the professions, trade and business, permit a deplorable cleavage in their conscience, and live a life too little in conformity with the clear principles of justice and Christian charity" (*Divini Redemptoris,* National Catholic Welfare Conference edition #55).

The background of most Jesuits is not such as to make Ours aware of or interested in social problems. The course in the Society does not include sufficient training in the social teachings of the Church as one of its principal objectives. In our courses in philosophy and theology almost exclusive emphasis is given to inculcating general principles without due regard

to their application to the concrete circumstances of time and place. Lacking the counter-balance of formal instruction in Catholic social theory and practice, we Jesuits tend to identify our thinking and loyalty with the interests of the "bourgeois" middle class. Hence, in important aspects, the thought and action habits of an indeterminate but significant number of American Jesuits correspond to the expected behavior patterns of this middle class. Thus when we reach the classroom either as regents or, later on, as priests too often we have no adequate grasp either of the importance or the methodology of teaching Catholic social doctrine. And this despite Pius XI when in the closing section of *Quadragesimo Anno,* (N.C.W.C. ed. #142) he said, "It is chiefly your duty, Venerable Brethren, and of your clergy to search diligently for those lay apostles both of workers and employers, to select them with prudence, and to train and instruct them properly. A difficult task, certainly, is thus imposed on priests, *and to meet it, all who are growing up as the hope of the Church* (scholastics and seminarians) *must be duly prepared by an intensive study of the social question.*"

It does not come easy, but if we are to be honest with ourselves we must admit the possibility that we Jesuit educators are all too often failing in training our students to think and act in accordance with the social doctrine of the Church. Thus our undoubted success in developing students to be good individuals and to become good family members is marred by our widespread failure to instruct them in what it means to be good members of society. Lacking this instruction, the Jesuit graduate is the rule and not the exception who patterns his socio-economic conduct according to the dictates of the secularized institutions in which he lives and works. To counteract this compartmentalizing of his religion he needs the strong antidote of integral Catholicism, which can and does pronounce authoritatively in economic and social matters and not alone in matters dogmatic and spiritual (cf. *Quadragesimo Anno,* #s 41-43). But if he is not supplied with this antidote and taught how to use it by his Jesuit teachers, there is small chance, as experience amply proves, that later on he will accept it if ever he comes to know what it is.

The Danger of Irrelevance

If what we have said in the foregoing pages has objectivity, then there is urgent need for radical reorientation and updating in the content and methodology of all phases of the Jesuit educational system. If such major changes are not forthcoming, there will be solid ground for skepticism relative to the adequacy of Jesuit education in today's world.

Some time ago we had a long discussion with a nun, president of one of the highest-rated Catholic women's colleges in the United States, on the subject of the social failures of Catholic higher education. This nun has her doctorate from a Jesuit university and is a great admirer of the Society. Her admiration, however, is of a discriminating variety. She is sharply critical of what she considers a serious defect in our educational approach: failure to incorporate social formation into the regular curriculum.

"Every year," she said bluntly, "several hundred young women graduate from this college of which I am president. But few if any of them are equipped to face *as Catholics* the challenge of modern-day problems." This was shocking enough, but what followed was even more so. "The chief source of this unpreparedness," she continued, "is a widespread, smug satisfaction on the part of most Catholic educators which makes them too complacent to recognize the necessity for updating curricula," And then came the real hammer blow. "And for this I attribute the principal fault to you Jesuits. For you cannot deny that to a very large extent, the Jesuits early in the history of higher Catholic education in this country took the lead and have held it ever since. You have for the most part set the pace. But the pace you set has not kept up with the incredibly rapid changes in the character of the modern world."

We record this conversation piece for whatever agreement or rebuttal we want to give it. But in appraising what the good nun had to say, it will be well to bear in mind the severe indictment of Father General, cited earlier, regarding the social deficiency of our colleges and universities.

It would seem, then, that whatever revision we consider necessary for the Jesuit educational system in particular is valid for the Catholic educational system in general.

Pope Paul and Relevance

Perhaps no one more than our present Holy Father recognizes the urgency of "bringing up to date" the strategy and tactics of the Church if the Christian message is to be meaningful in the modern age. When Pope Paul was still Archbishop of Milan, he had this blunt observation to make:

> "The modern world has looked at the priest with eyes inflammed with hostile sarcasm and blinded by a utilitarian approach. The heir of the long-dead Middle Ages, the ally of selfish conservatism, the high priest of a silenced litany, the stranger in life—this is the priest. The clergy . . . has felt the repelling aversion of society in the midst of the new needs of the century.
>
> ". . . We must go out and look for the great multitudes. It is up to the priest, not the people, to take the initiative. It is useless for the priest to ring his bell. No one listens. What is necessary is that the priest be able to hear the factory sirens, to understand the temples of technology where the modern world lives and throbs. It is up to him to become a missionary anew if he wants Christianity to endure. . . ."

Why the Irrelevance?

Many times in the past we have suggested that the reason why Catholic education faces the great danger of "irrelevance" in the modern world, and why the clergy "has felt the repelling aversion of society in the midst of the new needs of the century" lies in the failure to recognize that, although the substance of Catholic education never changes, the forms into which it is cast must vary according to the changing demands of changing times. Too often it is true that we are still trying to do new jobs with old tools. No wonder, then, that the Church is made to appear as though it were "the ally of selfish conservatism"; no wonder that the priest often is regarded as "the high priest of a silenced litany," as a "stranger" to modern man.

This failure in updating can be traced chiefly to the neglect to incorporate the social teachings of the Church into curricula on every level of our educational system, and thus to fall considerably short of teaching integral Catholicism, of presenting Catholicism in its fullness.

It is scarcely an exaggeration to say that the large majority of graduates from Catholic high schools, colleges and semi-

naries simply are not equipped with a sufficiently developed sense of social responsibility. If this were not true, the scandal of Catholics going off in all directions in political, economic and social life would not exist, at least not in the dimensions that it does today.

These Catholics lacking any firm grounding in social principles and practices can hardly be expected to make any significant contribution toward the Christian reshaping of social institutions. And it is the Christian reconstruction of social order that constitutes the overall objective of the papal social encyclicals. But without knowledge of these encyclicals, most Catholics in their post-school years do not enter into the apostolate of social thought and action as prescribed by the encyclicals; on the contrary, whatever social philosophy they may have is absorbed from the "mores" of their secular environment, which, in many instances, go directly counter to the social directives of the Church.

The Key to Relevance

The point we are striving to make here is that the extent to which "the teachings of the Church will be regarded by the average man as irrelevant and impertinent to his dilemma" can be gauged by the degree in which graduates are coming out of our schools and seminaries with neither intellectual commitment to the social teachings of the Church nor practical skills to implement them. In other words, if Catholic graduates take their place in the occupational hierarchy without knowledge of and hence without commitment to and involvement in the social directives of the Church, there can be little hope of their acting as leaven in the mass to promote the observance of social justice and social charity.

In this connection it may not be out of place to cite from Dr. Martin Luther King, the founder of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference and one of the most distinguished religious leaders in this country today:

> "Any religion which professes to be concerned about the souls of men and is not concerned about the social and economic conditions that scar the soul, is a spiritually moribund religion only waiting for the day to be buried."

To identify Catholicism with the "any religion" of the quotation is to do violence to the Faith. And yet in the minds of many outside the Church, Catholicism is so being identified. This is so because too many Catholics, both in the clergy and laity, are unmindful of their social obligations or unwilling to assume the risks necessarily involved in applying the Church's social doctrine to the concrete circumstances of given social evils, the evils, for instance, of racial segregation. For Catholics to stand aloof even in the face of obvious and serious violations of justice and charity which undercut human dignity is to project the Church in the image of an irrelevant institution outside the main stream of life in today's world.

People do not meet the Church; they meet Catholics. Hence, the nature of the Church and its relevance to the problems of our times are most often judged by the conduct of Catholics. And when Catholics are delinquent in their social responsibilities, the Church itself, however illogically, is reckoned callous toward or indifferent to human sufferings.

The key to relevance in the Church's modern apostolate, therefore, is an educational system geared to the development of a select corps of priests and laity with sound knowledge of the social teachings of the Church and with a determination to find through research and practical experience effective means of translating the general principles of social justice and social charity into realistic instruments of remedy and reform in the existential world of men and their problems.

The relevancy, therefore, of our Catholic Faith to the whole gamut of human living and not merely to its individualistic expression will become evident only when graduates of the Catholic educational system go out into society trained to function as "transmission belts" of Christ's glad tidings to their fellow men in every walk of life.

But this happy result can be hoped for only if the products of our schools are made to understand the practical pertinence of theological and philosophical truth to the down-to-earth problems besetting modern man, such as, materialism, Communism, secularism, thermo-nuclear weapons, disarmament, foreign aid, the United Nations, the international and domestic scandal of racial discrimination, the human and economic effects of automation, the paradox of poverty in the midst of

the "affluent society," of chronic unemployment, of substandard housing, of the decaying central city within this same society, etc.

The admittedly difficult assignment to get young men and women ready to meet these problems with the Christian ethic is the overriding challenge to Catholic educators. But the challenge will go unheeded and the greatest opportunity perhaps in all history will be lost to the Church unless "the social teachings proclaimed by the Catholic Church (is made a vital component of) her traditional teaching regarding man's life" (*Mater et Magistra*, #222). For only through the principles and practices of her social doctrine can the bridge be built between the sanctuary and the vast arena of man's temporal life. Otherwise, society will set its course outside the influence of the Church's redemptive mission and the danger of her irrelevance to the modern world will be realized.

A Report

OUR LADY'S YOUTH CENTER

IN 1953 A SETTLEMENT HOUSE known as Our Lady's Youth Center was set in operation by Sacred Heart Parish in South El Paso, Texas. This Jesuit slum parish, sixteen city blocks square, touches on the international border and reaches into El Paso to enclose 10% of the population, or 30,000 persons, predominately Mexicans.

Most of the members of Sacred Heart Parish are Mexicans who have crossed the international bridge from Juarez. Each year about 10,000 Mexicans arrive while 10,000 leave—for California. As many as fourteen persons live in a two-room unit which, without running water or indoor plumbing, rents for $15 to $25 a month. Tenants call their home a *presidio* (prison). One block of six apartments is known as the "Six Hells."

Wages are expectedly low in this surplus-labor market area. Living conditions are sub-standard and will remain so in spite of all the hopes placed in the recent settlement of the "Chamizal question" between Mexico and the U.S. This settlement will irremediably deprive the area of two playgrounds, which is a small yet vital fact since it effects 4,000 children.

Half of the families in the parish area are ruled and supported by the male parent. Many children have never seen their father and depend on their mother for food and guidance. Therefore one of the first tasks set to the parish was to present alternatives to these children and teen-agers to their gang membership and gang fighting.

Throughout the parish area one could notice crude signs painted on building walls: Lucky 13's, 4-F's, 7-X's. Gang names. These groups of *chicanos* were inimical to both Mexican traditions and Yankee culture and could make gang war murderous.

In November of 1953, Rev. Harold Rahm, S.J., assistant at Sacred Heart Parish, transformed an abandoned K of C clubhouse into Our Lady's Youth Center. Youngsters from the area flocked in for dancing, movies, parties and *doctrina* (catechism). But just as the Center began to gain support from people of all faiths throughout the city, the *chicano* hoodlums stymied the effort. A small child was not allowed to cross the street to enter the Center without paying 10¢ to the controlling

gang. Any gang member who entered the Center was beaten or knifed on his return to his peer group. Staff members of the Center on his return to his peer group. Staff members of the Center were shot at many times, but zip-gun aim is poor. Father Rahm was knifed once. All these clashes led to deep fear and children were afraid to come to the Center.

The Center was in the territory controlled by the Lucky 13's and their allies, the Little 9's. The 13's were a large group and with the 9's were engaged in "protecting" the Center from rival gangs, the most powerful being the 4-F's. Counterpart girl gangs were involved too, such as the "Golden Claws."

While the area was gripped in fear and civic agencies were in an uproar because of rising public concern, the Center's staff realized that they had made a mistake in policy. The Center's policy, had been to set up a "building-centered" program which appealed to the good kids but did not search out the teen-age hoods who were rejected by family, school, society and up until then, the Church. The Center responded to this gang challenge with an entirely new perspective. Traditional sociological theory in the United States was "building-centered." The new plan was to bypass the good kids for the time being and go out directly to the gangs. Father Rahm refers to this new approach as "aggressive social work." The building was to be considered merely as the hub of operations for supervisors working with each gang in their own territory which is sometimes only three blocks square. The goal for each supervisor was to gain acceptance from a particular gang and gradually to change that gang into a social club. The situation called for qualified supervisors, not policemen. Where did the supervisors come from?

They were recruited from the area itself, from the parish Sodality. Two young men and three young women volunteered one year full time to this effort. Since the beginning of the Center, the Sodality way of life had been offered to the staff members. No obligations imposed. Through weekly meetings effort is made to form the staff according to the sodality pattern. These supervisors were well chosen and prepared yet they had one special danger to beware, sentimentality.

There is no room for sentimentality in "aggressive social work." In trying to establish himself as a link between the gang and community, the supervisor must take care that he does not become a buffer between them. The supervisor could be led by sentimentality into assuming for himself the functions of a police court, the probation officer and welfare agencies. The supervisor could not overlook illegal actions of gang members such as selling narcotics to youngsters. The supervisor was sent from the Center to stand up with the boys and girls only when they were willing to stand up to their own obligations to society.

After aligning themselves successfully with the gangs, the supervisors formed an Intergroup Council, to which each gang sent two representatives. One gang, the Lads and Mads, controlled all the offices. The Lads and Mads were a group that had joined together, not for antisocial purposes, but for mutual protection; they were a "decent" group and blamed the "hoods" for all their difficulties in gaining middle-class acceptance.

The Lads and Mads insisted on following parliamentary procedure in the Council meetings, to the antagonism of the other gangs who were made uncomfortable by such pompous orderliness. The hoods resented the sissies but were beginning to admire the social and political skills of the Lads and Mads.

Gang fights rarely last more than a few seconds. Throughout the long three summer months of 1957, sparks and rumors of gang war had been flying around the Center and parish area. The Lucky 13's and Little 9's were still grouped defiantly around the 4-F's The Rebels broke up a party to attack members of the TPM gang. The 13's and 9's had stabbed three innocent bystanders on the streets. Gang war raged then it ended quickly and violently on the night of November 9, 1957.

A member of the Lucky 13's attacked one of the 4-F's. Humberto Salazar, 19 years old, lay in his blood on the floor of the Center, a knife through his heart.

Dead two hours later, Humberto could have taken with him all the hopes, long efforts and accomplishments of the Center supervisors had he not reached the only peak of gracious Christian adulthood left to him. With his dying breath Humberto asked forgiveness for his killer and he begged that gang war end with his death.

Humberto's forgiveness had to be thrown again and again into the faces of his revengeful 4-F gang. Through newspaper reports, through the supervisors, television and personal visits to the boys involved, Humberto's plea was delivered. "Where is it to end? Humberto had forgiven. We must all follow Humberto to forgiveness."

This time the boys listened and reached a turning point in their lives. Organized gangs were broken in South El Paso five weeks after Humberto's death by the formation of the Night Court.

This Court is a council with a revolving judge from the boys themselves, to whom they submit their problems for arbitration. The Court passes sentences such as expulsion from the Center, submission to the belt line, head shaving and fights in the gym. The Court offers these two individuals their choice of weapons—knives, open fists or gloves. Small chance that the boys will choose knives. Members of organized gangs are usually cowards as individuals and the bravado of the gang rings empty when a member must stand alone, face to face with his enemy, unprotected by the brute force of the gang.

The Night Court was a great victory for the Center and the unconventional idea of "aggressive social action" which was demanded by gang opposition to the Center and to what the Center symbolized.

Our Lady's Youth Center had survived its first five years of service and struggle. Now that a favorable climate pervaded the area, the Center adopted a three-point program and set up new goals. The Center now has: 1) a "building-centered program"; 2) a neighborhood program; 3) the Camp Juan Diego program.

As part of the "building-centered program," the Center maintains an Employment Agency which sends out 1,000 persons per month on new jobs. A nominal fee is made against each person seeking the job to take

care of office expenses. Various services are offered by the Center to job seekers: English classes twice a week, courses on modern appliances, baby care and hygiene. Job seekers may also use the showers at the Center while they are waiting to be called. Salaries are low. When people are desperate they will work for as little as $10 a week, and some employers offer only that much.

A Federal Credit Union serves the area from the Center. The playground and the streets adjacent to the Center, which are roped off by city ordinances from 7 to 10 nightly, accommodate approximately 1,000 teen-agers and youngsters in 7 day-a-week activities. Connected with the "building-centered program" are 49 clubs in the outer areas, with dancing, picnics, parties, sports, dramatics and music. A total of 200,000 persons a year participate in events held in the Center or which stem from the Center. A bread line, thrift store and nurse home visiting also stem from the Center.

The second is the "neighborhood program" which attends to problems, reforms and movements on a much broader level, the institutional, such as law enforcement by local and border patrols, health and recreation department procedures, city zoning laws, school drop-out, housing standards, citizenship and immigration requirements, international cooperation and public opinion. This program also initiates and maintains cooperation with other existing Welfare Agencies and all pertinent civic committees which originate in the mayor's office, the C of C, the Kiwanis, the K of C, the LULAC, to list a few.

The third is the Camp Juan Diego program, which provides camp facilities for week-end trips throughout the year and week-long intensive camping programs in the summer for boys and girls on alternate weeks.

To implement and guide this three-fold program, the Center has a Board of Directors which, by Constitution, "shall consist of not less than twenty nor more than forty members and shall be broadly representative of the entire community of El Paso."

This three-fold program is possible only through the cooperative efforts of many people: the parish, civic clubs who give materials and money, the United Fund, city recreation and police departments, the Border Patrol and others in the community. Without these combined interests and help, and especially without the hard work and determination of the Center Staff, Our Lady's Youth Center could not have begun nor survived. With the same hard work and determination, this "center" can happen anywhere. It must happen again and again in all areas of the world where the same vital problems surely exist.

E. Tafoya, S.J.

Father Joseph Timothy O'Callahan

"Any priest, in like circumstances, should do, and would do, what I did."

Richard J. Dowling, S.J.

A JESUIT FUNERAL is, usually, solemnly simple. But on the first day of Spring, March 21, 1964, in the little church-yard, nestling amid the hills of Packachoag, at Holy Cross College in Worcester, Massachusetts, a soul-stirring pageant was enacted. Three Bishops of the Roman Catholic hierarchy were present; the United States Navy Chief of Chaplains, Admiral Drerth, stood at attention; representatives of the federal, state, and civic governments stood among the mourners. A Captain of the U.S. Navy, in full-dress uniform, stood beside the grave, as the ramrod sailors fired their farewell salute. The haunting notes of "taps" echoed through the academic groves. Sailor pallbearers folded the flag, draping the coffin, and presented it to His Excellency, Most Reverend Bernard J. Flanagan, D.D., Bishop of Worcester, who, in turn, presented it to a ninety year old mother, seated in a wheel-chair. For this was the funeral of Captain Joseph T. O'Callahan, S.J., U.S.N. Chaplain Corps (retired).

Joseph T. O'Callahan was a Jesuit with a unique distinction. In the glorified history of the United States, he was the only Roman Catholic Chaplain ever awarded the cherished Congressional Medal of Honor.

"By their fruits you shall know them" said our Lord. When asked by a fellow chaplain how he explained his courage, Fr. O'Callahan answered: "I owe it to my Jesuit training." When his late commanding officer on the Franklin, then Captain Leslie E. Gehres, publicly stated: "The bravest man I ever

knew was Commander Joseph T. O'Callahan," Fr. O'Callahan's sincere rejoinder was: "Any priest, in like circumstances, should do, and would do, what I did." If success can be described as preparedness to meet your opportunities, Fr. O'Callahan's triumph hour loses much of its mystique. To be well-prepared for his alloted tasks could be called the key-note of his life.

Born in Roxbury, Massachusetts on May 14, 1905, Joseph Timothy O'Callahan was the third son of Cornelius J. O'Callahan and Alice Casey O'Callahan. He attended St. Mary's parochial school in Cambridge, Massachusetts for his elementary schooling. In September, 1918, he entered Boston College High School. Here, his promise began to flower. He was a solid student in the college preparatory course; he wrote for the class magazine; he was a member of the school dramatic society; he ran on the relay team. On July 30, 1922, he entered the Society of Jesus, at the novitiate of St. Andrew-on-Hudson, at Poughkeepsie, New York. There, on July 31, 1924, he pronounced his first vows as a Jesuit, and received his vow crucifix. Transferred to Weston College in 1926, he completed his philosophical studies there in 1929. From 1929 to 1931 he was a teaching member of the Physics Department at Boston College. September 1931 found him back at Weston College to begin the formal study of Theology. He was ordained a priest on June 20, 1934, by the late Bishop Thomas A. Emmett, S.J., then Bishop of Jamaica, B.W.I. The fall of 1935 welcomed Fr. O'Callahan as a tertian at St. Robert's Hall in Pomfret Center, Connecticut. Finishing tertianship, Fr. O'Callahan proceeded to Georgetown University for a year of special studies. In the summer of 1937 he was appointed to teach Cosmology to his brother Jesuits at Weston College. During the summer of 1938, Fr. O'Callahan was transferred to Holy Cross College to teach mathematics and Physics. By 1940, he was head of the Mathematics Department, and had founded a Mathematics Library.

Then, the ominous clouds of war were surging in an anxiety-afflicted world. To do his part as a Catholic citizen, Joseph T. O'Callahan, S.J., applied for a commission as a Navy chaplain. Many of his friends sincerely remonstrated with him. His hyper-tense nervous nature did not augur well for the strin-

gency of combat. More, his obvious talents in physics and mathematics could be used better for the war effort by teaching at Holy Cross, soon to be one of the top Naval R.O.T.C. units in the United States. But logical arguments were of little avail with the adamant Fr. O'Callahan. On August 7, 1940 he was commissioned a Lieutenant, junior grade, in the Navy Chaplain Corps. Paradoxically, his first duty assignment in the Navy was teaching calculus at the Naval Air Station at Pensacola, Florida. The fiery chaplain chafed at the confinement, yearning for sea duty, particularly aboard a carrier.

In April 1943, now Lieutenant (senior grade) O'Callahan realized his persisting desire. After eighteen months of shore duty, he reported to his first ship, the U.S.S. Ranger. For two and a half years, Fr. O'Callahan was aboard the Ranger. The good ship made few headlines. But she ranged the Atlantic from the arctic to the equator. She played a big part in the invasion of North Africa. She made hit and run raids against the Germans in Norway. Her chief morale officer was the newly promoted Lieutenant Commander O'Callahan. The Ranger long since has joined the scrap heap of outmoded sea giants. But the life stories of her gallant officers and crews are a golden page in U.S. Naval history. At Captain O'Callahan's wake, a beautiful crucifix was the treasured memento of appreciation from the officers and crew of the U.S.S. Ranger.

In December 1944, Father O'Callahan was assigned to shore duty at Ford Island, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii. After the moil and broil of combat duty, this was a cushion assignment for the energetic chaplain. His roommate recalls that he used to spend his evenings reading poetry.

But Fr. O'Callahan's life of quiet would be a brief one. His youngest sister, Alice, now Sister Rose Marie, O.P., was a Maryknoll nun, imprisoned in the Japanese detention camp in the Philippines. For three years, the O'Callahan family had not heard a word from her. So, Father Joseph prayed that he would be assigned to the Philippines, that he might at first hand discover the fate of his beloved sister. Little did he dream what life had in store for him.

On March 2, 1945, Fr. O'Callahan received peremptory orders from Captain John Warner Moore, fleet Chaplain of

U.S. Pacific Fleet and Ocean Areas from 1943-45, to report for duty to the U.S.S. Franklin (C.V. 13). He came aboard Big Ben at 15.35, amid piles of potatoes and ammunition, to keep his date with destiny.

The Franklin, an Essex class, 27,000 ton, aircraft carrier, was named after Admiral Farragut's flag-ship in the Civil War. She was commissioned in January 1944. In the engagement at Leyte Gulf, she was badly battered by the Japanese. But now she was back at Pearl Harbor, ready to join Task Force 58, to seek out and destroy the remnants of the Japanese Navy left after the disastrous defeat of the battle of the Philippine sea.

Shortly after dawn on March 3, 1945, Big Ben as she was affectionately called by the sailors, steamed out of Pearl Harbor to accomplish her task. She was only one of sixteen carriers, eight battleships, sixteen cruisers and sixty-three destroyers which made up the formidable American armada, called Task Force 58.

"Conspicuous Gallentry"

On Saturday afternoon of St. Patrick's day, on the forecastle deck of the Franklin, twelve hundred Roman Catholics, more than a third of the ship's completement, gathered for Mass. For too many, this would be their last Mass, since before dawn on the morrow, the first attack would be launched. Who would dare to surmise the thoughts of Commander O'Callahan, as he, another Christ, pronounced the General Absolution over his kneeling brothers?

After twelve General Quarters during the night, came the cool dawn of March 19th, St. Joseph's day. At 0700, fighters zoomed off the deck for a strike at Kobe. Thirty Hell Divers were still warming up on the flight deck. Chaplain O'Callahan was having his breakfast in the wardroom with a few officers.

At 7:07 a.m., out of the cloud bank, flashed a Jap Judy plane, flying 360 miles an hour at a height of seventy-five feet. It dropped one five hundred pound bomb on the center of the flight deck; then, swung around the island, and dropped another aft. Then, ominous silence, a momentary prelude to one of the most fearful tragedies in the history of the United States Navy. The world press has justly publicized the chaos

on the Franklin, but only a Dante could fittingly portray the inferno which greeted Commander O'Callahan, as he, hastily, left his unfinished breakfast.

However, for the ship that would not die, now came a beacon of hope, the white cross of the Chaplain's helmet. Amid the murk and fetid grime of destruction it flashed like a guiding star in the fight for survival. Apparently made of indestructible steel, Commander O'Callahan was everywhere; cajoling, helping, encouraging, inspiring. "Look at the old man up there (the Captain on the bridge). Don't let him down!" And this was the priest who, his friends knew, for years could not even stand the sight of blood.

The saga of the Franklin should be recounted in American history as one of the master triumphs of ecumenical courage. Race, color, or creed counted for naught in this sublime struggle of the brotherhood of man. The fatherhood of God, too, had splendid example in the tireless leadership of His vicar, His priest, O'Callahan. To the Jewish boys aboard, he was "Rabbi Tim"; to the Protestant lads, he was their "Padre Joe"; to all hands he was the counselor, consoler, exemplar. Though wounded by shrapnel, for which he was later to be decorated with the Purple heart, he carried on. There was a job to be done—his job—and he did it. Three days and three nights, he stayed at his post. When Japanese planes strafed the Franklin deck, Father O'Callahan continued his ministrations to the dying. When his skipper yelled: "Why don't you duck?" with a grin he answered: "God won't let me go, until He's ready." It was to be a wait of nineteen years.

Limping between two tugboats, the once mighty flagship, Franklin, arrived at Pearl Harbor on April 3, 1945, just one month to the day after she set out to do battle with the Japanese. Hardened Navy veterans were in tears at the sight. 832 officers and crew had lost their lives. But a nondescript band made up mostly of tin pans and an accordian and two horns—and organized by Father O'Callahan heartily sang: "Oh, the old Big Ben, she ain't what she used to be." When the fleet chaplain met the late Rev. Admiral Gehres, U.S.N. (retired) on the flight deck, he asked the skipper: "What about your two chaplains?" Squaring his shoulders, the doughty warrior answered "Each of those two chaplains were worth to me any

six officers under my command." At Pearl Harbor, also, Chaplain OCallahan organized what he called a "most exclusive club," the 706 Club. These were the men who had survived the catastrophe of the Franklin. Until their death day, their membership card in the 706 Club was one of their most cherished trophies.

Once again under her own power, the Franklin proceeded from Pearl Harbor, by way of the Panama Canal, to the Brooklyn Navy Yard. War time precaution prevented any civic celebration. But on a beautiful Spring morning, on the forward flight deck, an appreciative Navy honored her hero sons. Truly, it was an historic ceremony for an historic ship. 388 deserved decorations were bestowed, the greatest number ever given to the personnel of a single ship in Navy history.

Next came Father O'Callahan's own triumph hour. On January 23, 1946 at the White House in Washington, D.C., President Harry Truman placed the Medal of Honor around his neck. The student who literally was scared stiff before his final examinations, now wore his nation's highest honor. But his joy was not for his modest self. Rather, his eyes keenly watched God's first gift and first teacher to him, his tear-misted mother. His grateful country had glorified him as a symbol of its faith in God and in its citizens. Yet that night the dutiful chaplain returned to his ship, the new air-craft carrier Franklin D. Roosevelt.

However, the glare of pubilicity did not change Chaplain O'Callahan. On June 17, 1945, he was invited to be the commencement speaker at his beloved Alma Mater, Georgetown University. On that occasion, also, he was laureled with the honorary degree of Doctor of Science. His terse talk to the war-tense graduates was characteristically O'Callahan. "Take life seriously," he pleaded, "which means for your happiness, that you live your life as God would have you lead it."

On the 12th of November 1946, Father O'Callahan was released from the Navy, with the rank of Captain, U.S.N.C.C. (retired).

Return to Holy Cross

Returning to his religious community, Fr. O'Callahan planned to spend the remainder of his life, working for the

Japanese missions, and the missions of the Caroline Islands. His religious superiors readily cooperated with his wishes. But his yearnings far surpassed his strength. What effect Father O'Callahan's traumatic experience aboard the Franklin had on his physical and mental well-being must now remain a medical mystery. Suffice it to say, that never again in life would he enjoy adequate health to carry out professorial duties. Yet, "quitting" was never a word in Father O'Callahan's vocabulary.

Back to his first love, Holy Cross, he came to teach philosophy. His medal of honor was locked in the library safe to remain there, at his request, until his death. The Navy chaplain was again the consecrated Jesuit professor. With single-minded will power he went to work. But his anguished body refused to cooperate. On December 1949, he suffered his first stroke. The glory of Thabor and the acclaim of the medal of honor would yield to the silent suffering of Gethsemane. Yet the same unflagging spirit which merited him the medal of honor aboard the Franklin now flared anew—and even stronger. His first stroke had left his right arm paralyzed. Hour after hour, day after day, he exercised that weak member, to restore it to efficient usefulness. Still, amid his lonely hours, there were some refreshing consolations. A personal letter from his commander-in-chief, President Harry Truman, spurred him to carry on. In 1956 the motion picture, "Battle Stations," depicting his life; appeared in American theaters. On September 21, 1956, a helicopter landed on Fitton Field at Holy Cross College. The commanding officer of the Quonset Naval Air Station, Captain P. C. Needham presented the invalid hero with the color film "Sage of the Franklin." This film is an historic recorded sequence of Father O'Callahan's heroic performance of duty aboard the Franklin and is now used as an exemplar in the training of Navy recruits.

Truly, the glamor hero of acclaim was now the hidden hermit of pain. Patient, he was, but his was the perceptive patience of Job, "the Lord hath given, the Lord hath taken away." Come glory, come torture, all was God's will. Yet never was he bitter. Few humans could realize more vividly, "man's inhumanity to man" in the awful armageddon that is modern warfare. Still, each summer he prepared meticulously

for fall classes, trusting and hoping that by September he would be strong enough to return to the class room. Now, also, he prepared his best-seller book: "I was Chaplain on the Franklin," though some days he was able only to compose a short paragraph. Perhaps his deepest source of strength was his daily Mass. He had received ecclesiastical permission to offer his Mass sitting down. Some days, he literally dragged himself to the altar to share with Christ the infinite sacrifice of love.

Then came a deceptive plateau of peace. During the last year of his life, his health and spirits seemed to improve. His ready grin was often in evidence. Tuesday was St. Patrick's day and he looked forward to its celebration. For him it was an anniversary of treasured memories: the last General Absolution aboard the Franklin, his Doctor altarboy now praying for him in heaven. He began his day by reading St. Patrick's Mass. Then, at the breakfast table, he suffered a slight stroke. As soon as a room could be procured for him, he was transferred to St. Vincent's Hospital. His mind remained very clear; his wit was never sharper. He was in God's Hands. Even if this were to be his last battle, let God's Holy Will be done. As even in his life, he was prepared. Tuesday night, Fr. O'Callahan endured a restless siege, but on Wednesday morning he appeared much improved. However, late on Wednesday afternoon he took a bad turn. Yet he cheerfully said "Goodbye" to his loved ones, as they left his room about 10:30 P.M. About five minutes later he suffered a slight convulsion. Five of his Jesuit priest brothers, two Sisters of Providence, and his physician were standing beside his death-bed reciting the prayers for the dying. At 10:40 P.M., during the prayers, his noble soul, quietly, went home to God. It was a wonderful way for a great American, a great Jesuit, and a true priest to die. The official medical report of his death coldly stated: that the cause of his death was a ruptured, aortic, abdominal, aneurysm.

On the plain coffin at Father O'Callahan's wake were two symbols which, most fittingly, capsule his life. Side by side on his coffin, lay his vow crucifix, and his medal of honor. On his first vow day, on St. Ignatius' feast in 1924, as a symbol of his dedication to Ignatian ideals, he received his vow crucifix. From that hour, until he was cradled in his grave, he would be

a man crucified to the world, and to whom the world is crucified. More, this son of a soldier saint would strive to gain the crown of Ignatian humility, that all the acts of his life should be done for the greater glory of God. Only through carrying the daily cross Christ chose to send him, could he attain this goal. Drab, monotonous and dreary, many days would be; others might be spent amid the plaudits of the multitudes, cheering daring deeds of heroism. Yet, through all his life the ruling motive of all his actions should be love of God, sweetened by his saving grace. The vow crucifix could be tear-stained but the warrior of God carried on—even unto blood. The medal of honor pledged mute evidence of how well this servant of the Crucified, fulfilled his assigned tasks. Truly, the eternal "Amen," uttered by Father Joseph Timothy O'Callahan, S.J., on his death-bed, came from a holocausted heart to divine love.

Presidential Citation

In the files of the manuscript department of the Dinand Library at Holy Cross College rests a precious parchment. It is the official citation, issued by the President of the United States, when he bestowed the medal of honor on Father O'Callahan. Thus does the most powerful nation in the world, through the voice of her commander-in-chief, speak of her humble Jesuit citizen: "For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity, at the risk of his life, above and beyond the call of duty, while serving as Chaplain on Board the U.S.S. Franklin, when the vessel was fiercely attacked by enemy Japanese aircraft, during offensive operations near Kobe, Japan, on 19 March, 1945. A valiant and forceful leader, calmly braving the perilous barriers of flame and twisted metal to aid his men and his ship, Lieutenant Commander O'Callahan, groped his way through smoke-filled corridors to the flight-deck, and into the midst of violently exploding bombs, shells, rockets and other armament. With the ship rocked by incessant explosions, with debris and fragments raining down and fires raging in ever-increasing fury, he ministered to the wounded and dying, comforting and encouraging men of all faiths; he organized and led fire-fighting crews into the blazing inferno on the flight deck; he directed the jettisoning of live ammunition and

the flooding of the magazine; he manned a hose to hot, armed bombs, rolling dangerously on the burning deck, continuing his efforts, despite searing, suffocating smoke, which forced men to fall back gasping, and imperiled others who replaced them. Serving with courage, fortitude, and deep, spiritual strength, Lieutenant Commander O'Callahan inspired the gallant officers and men of the Franklin to fight heroically, and with profound faith, in the face of almost certain death, return their stricken ship to port."